DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 132 HE 028 333

TITLE	Campus Tensions in Connecticut: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hartford.
SPONS AGENCY	Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 94
NOTE	120p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; Campuses; *Civil Rights; College Administration; *College Environment; College Faculty; College Students; Crime; Crime Prevention; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Opinions; Public Colleges; *Racial Relations; *Social Discrimination; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*Connecticut; Diversity (Faculty); Diversity (Student); Hate Crime

ABSTRACT

This report records and expands on presentations made by 30 speakers who addressed an April 27, 1992 fact finding meeting on racial tension on college campuses in Connecticut. Section 1 describes the Tristate Project in New England and offers background information on the state and its colleges. Section 2 summarizes the remarks of opening speakers representing community and government agencies. Section 3 reports on three panels from the University of Connecticut, a student panel, an administrators panel, and a faculty panel. Section 4 reports on three similarly composed panels from Wesleyan University. Section 5 summarizes the participants' comments and their recommendations including a unanimous agreement that forms of bias related problems and tensions adversely affected each of the institutions, and that campuses need to accommodate the increasingly multicultural elements of American society. Section 6 offers findings and recommendations of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Appendixes contain information on 1992 college enrollment by race, state policy regarding racism and acts of intolerance, a statement of the National Association of Scholars, and a statement by Peter B. Luh of the Asian Faculty and Staff Association. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 382 132

Campus Tensions in Connecticut: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties

Connecticut Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

HE028333

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

September 1994

This report of a factfinding meeting of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the participants in the factfinding meeting, other individuals or documents cited, or the Advisory Committee.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, first created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and reestablished by the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of equal protection based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: the investigation of discriminatory denials of the right to vote; the study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection; the appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection; the maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection; and the investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and section 6(c) of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

Campus Tensions in Connecticut: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties

Connecticut Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

September 1994

HE 028 333

This report of a factfinding meeting of the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the participants in the factfinding meeting, other individuals or documents cited, or the Advisory Committee.

Letter of Transmittal

Connecticut Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Members of the Commission
Mary Frances Berry, *Chairperson*
Cruz Reynoso, *Vice Chairperson*
Carl A. Anderson
Arthur A. Fletcher
Robert P. George
Constance Horner
Russell G. Redenbaugh
Charles Pei Wang
Mary K. Mathews, *Staff Director*

This report, *Campus Tensions in Connecticut: Searching for Solutions in the Nineties*, records and expands on presentations made by 30 speakers who addressed an April 27, 1992, factfinding meeting held by the Connecticut Advisory Committee. It has been updated through reference to various documents, many easily accessible to the general public. Benefiting from the work of our Massachusetts and Vermont counterparts who had convened similar prior meetings, we first heard from the commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Higher Education and the Region I Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education.

The panelists who followed represented students, administrators, faculty, or staff from the University of Connecticut (UCONN) at Storrs or Wesleyan University. Our choice of our State's flagship university and a private liberal arts school of national repute mirrored the choices made by the Advisory Committees in Massachusetts and Vermont. The students included the head of the UCONN student government and officers or members of racial or ethnic minority organizations from both institutions.

Among the UCONN administrators were the president, a vice president, a dean, and an associate dean, the director of an ethnic cultural center, and the directors of affirmative action on two UCONN campuses. Several UCONN professors also spoke. From Wesleyan University came the dean of the college—the first woman and the first Hispanic to hold that position—the executive assistant to the president, an associate dean, and two professors, one of whom had chaired Wesleyan University's Presidential Commission on Racial Relations. Of five other organizations also invited, only the heads of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in Connecticut, a local Hillel Foundation, and the Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education contributed to this report. However, there was a clear consensus among the speakers, panelists, and contributors that bias-related problems and tensions adversely affected both campuses and that each institution needed to do more to accommodate the increasingly multicultural elements of American society.

The summary outlines issues, problems, and suggestions described by the contributors. We shall add only two observations here. The first stems from our favorable impression of the student participation from both campuses. Indeed, Mario Sanabria, the Committee

Sanabria—the Committee member who presided over our factfinding meeting but who has since moved to Atlanta—was so impressed as to urge that we recruit a college student leader to fill his vacant seat.

The second involves a dilemma. With the arrival of the 40th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, efforts continue to be made to integrate more minority students into predominantly white colleges. But on campuses in Connecticut and elsewhere there has also been a move toward cultural sensitivity and diversity accompanied by increased demands for separate ethnic studies programs, with cafeterias and other public gathering places often becoming more visibly self-segregated. These latter phenomena seem to run counter to efforts to achieve true integration and to strengthen the "university" in concept as well as in reality.

A March 1994 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* touches upon the dilemma:

> On the one hand, African American or Latino students enter [college,] the classic institution of upward mobility, the path enabling them to become full members of the dominant consumer culture. On the the other hand, they bridle at the cultural costs and demand courses, centers, and recognition of an identity they are leaving behind.[1]

Of course, we remain sympathetic to the minority students who feel compelled to band together out of a sense of isolation or alienation at predominantly white schools and who desire to study the history of their community and culture in this country. Still, in the half century during which blood was shed to overcome de jure segregation, we find troubling the widespread reports of self-segregation on many campuses.[2]

The tension or strain between the drive toward diversity and the goal of integration may or may not represent an unavoidable phase in the development of campus life across the Nation. But, among the college students of this decade are the leaders of the next century, and the dilemma they face may warrant a national study by the Commissioners.

This report was unanimously approved by the 9 members present during the Committee's vote at its June 28, 1993, meeting in Hartford City Hall. Afterwards, two members registered approval, but no indication of approval was received from the last member.

Sincerely,

Ivor J. Echols

IVOR J. ECHOLS, D.S.W., *Chairperson*
Connecticut Advisory Committee

---

[1] Russell Jacoby, "The Most Radical Afrocentric Ideologue Is Culturally an American," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Mar. 30, 1994, p. B-5.

[2] See, for example, Mary Jordan, "College Dorms Reflect Trend of Self-Segregation," *Washington Post*, Mar. 6, 1994, p. A-1.

Connecticut State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Ivor J. Echols, *Chairperson*
Windsor

Mikki Aganstata
Hartford

Walter L. Benjamin
Windsor

Rosalind Berman
New Haven

Margery L. Gross
Guilford

Patrick J. Johnson, Jr.
West Hartford

Neil Macy
Bloomfield

Lou B. McKenzie-Wharton
West Hartford

Nancy Orsi*
Plainville

Ramon A. Pacheco*
Farmington

Alberto J. Rodriguez*
Avon

Le Lien Smith
North Haven

James H. Stewart
Storrs

Mario Sanabria**
Stamford

*New members appointed after the factfinding meeting
**Former member who was the presiding officer for the factfinding meeting

---

Acknowledgments
The Connecticut State Advisory Committee wishes to thank the staff of the Commission's Eastern Regional Office for its help in the preparation of this report. The factfinding meeting and summary report were the principal assignments of Tino Calabia with support from Linda Raufu. Editorial assistance and preparation of the report for publication were provided by Gloria Hong Izumi with legal sufficiency review by Kathryn A. Monroe. The project was carried out under the overall supervision of John I. Binkley, Director, Eastern Regional Office.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
    Tristate Project in New England 1
    Background on the State and the Schools 2

II. OPENING SPEAKERS 5
    Connecticut Board of Higher Education 5
    Published Comments by Other State Officials 9
    Region I Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education 10
    Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 11
    Hillel Foundation 18
    Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education . . 19
    International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators 20

III. UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT 21

UCONN STUDENT PANEL 21
    UCONN Undergraduate Student Government 21
    Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center Advisory Board 24
    African American Cultural Center Advisory Board 27
    Asian American Association 29
    UCONN Hillel Student Council 32
    Intercultural Federation 34

UCONN PANEL OF ADMINISTRATORS 35
    Office of the UCONN President 35
    Division of Student Affairs and Services 36
    School of Engineering 38
    Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center 40
    Office of Affirmative Action Programs 42
    Health Center Affirmative Action Office 44
    Savage, Terry, Ting, Rios, Clemons on Multiculturalism Debate . . . 47

UCONN FACULTY PANEL 49
    African American Studies Institute 49
    Department of Sociology 51
    School of Engineering 53
    School of Social Work 56
    Community Medicine/Health Care 59

IV. WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY 62

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT PANEL 62
    Ajua-Campos and Student of Color Council 62

Ujamaa-Wesleyan Black Community Student Union 64
Wesleyan Asian/Asian American Student Union 67
Wesleyan University Havurah 71

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS PANEL 71
Office of the Dean 71
Office of the President 77
Office of the Associate Dean 85
Adams, Montero, McLellan on Accountability 84

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY FACULTY PANEL 86
Biology Department 86
Department of Psychology 91

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPEAKERS 96

VI. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 100

VII. APPENDICES

A. 1992 College Enrollment by Race 105
B. State Policy Regarding Racism and Acts of Intolerance 106
C. Statement of the National Association of Scholars 107
D. Statement by Peter B. Luh, Pres., Asian Faculty & Staff Assoc. 108

I. INTRODUCTION

Tristate Project in New England

Delegates from State Advisory Committees serving Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont launched a series of three factfinding meetings on campus tensions in New England at a forum held at the University of Massachusetts (UMASS), Amherst campus, in September 1991. As noted in the October 1992 report on that first factfinding meeting, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published *Bigotry and Violence on American College Campuses* in October 1990 and, by an earlier resolution, had encouraged its Advisory Committees to consider followup projects in their States.[3] The Advisory Committees in New England that chose to take up the Commission's suggestion also acted on an expectation that some solutions or approaches to the problem might be identified that could alleviate problems on local campuses and prove useful elsewhere.

Representing the Connecticut Advisory Committee during the Amherst meeting was Chairperson Ivor J. Echols. She and her fellow delegates heard 23 representatives of the students, administrators, faculty, and staffs of UMASS and nearby Smith College. These 23 speakers had been briefly preceded by officials from the Massachusetts Department of Education, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. State police and prosecutors also appeared at the end of the kickoff meeting, while other speakers represented the New England Board of Higher Education and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law.

As in Massachusetts, the second factfinding meeting in the series involved Vermont's flagship campus, the University of Vermont in Burlington, and a selective, private liberal arts institution, Middlebury College. Held in Burlington in February 1992, that meeting similarly heard from students, administrators, faculty, and staff of the two institutions plus the staff head of the Vermont Human Rights Commission—more than three dozen speakers in all. In April 1992, at the University of Connecticut (UCONN) health center in Farmington, the third factfinding meeting opened with the commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Higher Education, the Region I Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education, and the director of the State office of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.[4] The 26 on-campus panelists then shared their perspectives on tensions at UCONN and Wesleyan University.

---

[3] See also U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Briefing on Campus Violence: A Resolution," July 15, 1988. In it, the Commission "resolved that the Commission encourage its State Advisory Committees to review the subject of bias-related incidents on college campuses. . . ."

Background on the State and the Schools

Less than a month before the meeting in Connecticut, the *New York Times* reported that in the course of the 1980s, Connecticut became "America's wealthiest State . . . as its residents' incomes soared and its poverty rate declined. . . ."[5] However, just several months afterwards, the *New York Times* noted that the State of "Connecticut only spends 6 percent of its budget on higher education—half the national average for States"—and the article focused on the strained budgets of colleges in Connecticut, especially of the public universities there.

> Although the roughly $10,000 a year for tuition, room, and board and other fees at schools like the University of Connecticut . . . may be a bargain compared with private colleges charging more than twice as much, to many middle-class and poorer families it seems like a betrayal of the historic premise of State universities as affordable, democratic institutions. . . . The effects have been particularly acute for UCONN which has been a haven for students unable to afford or get into Ivy League and other private New England colleges.[6]

An April 1994 *Wall Street Journal* article reported that the State appropriated just $150 per capita in support of higher education, ranking Connecticut only 35th among all States.[7]

The 1994 edition of a popular guide to 2,000 colleges has speculated that the UCONN flagship campus at Storrs "suffers because many of [Connecticut's wealthy] residents send their children to private, out-of-State schools."[8] The guide cited a student source as saying that one of the two "big social issues" at UCONN was racism, but that the problem was being addressed by the administration."[9] The 1993 edition of the same guide had pointed out that "this 3,100-acre rural campus is the home of one Northeastern public school that wants to be taken seriously. . . . The percentage of students who complete 4 years and earn their degrees from UCONN is high for a State school."[10] (Appendix A provides UCONN's enrollment statistics by race.)

---

[4] Representatives of the Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education (CALAHE) and the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators were also invited, had agreed to speak, but did not appear. However, the incumbent CALAHE president subsequently submitted a statement summarized on pp. 19-20.

[5] Andrew L. Yarrow, "Census Shows Connecticut Is Richest State," *New York Times*, Mar. 31, 1992, p. B-1 (hereafter cited as "Census Shows Connecticut Is Richest State").

[6] Andrew L. Yarrow, "At UCONN, Costs Squeeze Its Students," *New York Times*, Aug. 16, 1992, pp. 37, 42 (hereafter cited as "At UCONN, Costs Squeeze Its Students").

[7] John R. Wilke, "The Outlook: New England Economy Searches for Renewal," *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 18, 1994, p. 1.

As in Massachusetts and Vermont, the State Advisory Committee in Connecticut invited speakers from the State's flagship public campus at Storrs to participate in its factfinding meeting. The Committee also invited speakers from Wesleyan University, a small, selective private institution in Middletown. In its October 1982 report, *Hate Groups and Acts of Bigotry: Connecticut's Response*, the Committee had noted that Wesleyan University was the site of a rally against racism during a period in 1980-81 when Ku Klux Klan demonstrations and cross-burnings were occurring.[11] The aforementioned 1994 guide to colleges has observed that "Wesleyan is described on one of its most oft sighted T-shirts as DIVERSITY UNIVERSITY. . . ," and that it is also "one of the most richly endowed institutions per capita,"[12] with "a long-standing commitment to minorities [that] has yielded . . . one of the highest percentages for minority students at any liberal arts college in the nation."[13]

Regarding diversity, in a May 1990 editorial, the *Middletown Press* stated that "among the elite institutions, [Wesleyan University] led the way in the early admission of black students in significant numbers and . . . to this day signally incorporates ethnic and cultural diversity in its curriculum. . . ."[14] Later, in an April 1992 cover story on the future of

---

[8] Edward B. Fiske, *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1994* (New York: Times Books/Random House, 1993), p. 234 (hereafter cited as *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1994*).

[9] *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1994*, p. 202.

[10] *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1993*, pp. 231-32.

[11] Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hate Groups and Acts of Bigotry: Connecticut's Response*, October 1982, p. 62.

[12] *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1994*, p. 749.

[13] Ibid., p. 751.

[14] "The Ironic Tumult on the Hill," *Middletown Press*, May 10, 1990, editorial page (hereafter cited as "The Ironic Tumult on the Hill").

American colleges, *Time* magazine's brief reference to campus multiculturalism cited only one professor—a Wesleyan University faculty member. *Time* explained that this teacher has sought to discover a consensus or at least some common ground among those who have taken opposite sides in the controversy over multiculturalism and to chart a different approach to the issue.[15]

---

[15] John Elson, "Campus of the Future . . . .," *Time*, Apr. 13, 1992, p. 58.

II. OPENING SPEAKERS

Connecticut Advisory Committee Chairperson Ivor Echols, a professor emeritus of UCONN's school of social work on the West Hartford campus, opened the meeting. She described the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and its 51 State Advisory Committees, supplied background on how the proposal for a campus tensions project in Connecticut became a three-State joint undertaking in New England, and introduced the nine Connecticut Advisory Committee members present. Because of her relationship to UCONN, Echols explained that Committee member Mario Sanabria of Stamford would preside over the factfinding meeting. Sanabria then introduced Dr. Harry J. Hartley, president of the nine-campus University of Connecticut who welcomed the Committee, the speakers, and audience. (Hartley's statement about campus tensions at UCONN appears in section III, pages 35-36.)

Connecticut Board of Higher Education

Sanabria next introduced Commissioner Andrew G. De Rocco of the Connecticut Department of Higher Education who explained that the department's board of governors was the "coordinating authority for all public and private colleges and universities in the State of Connecticut." De Rocco noted that since the board's inception in 1982, it has "given priority to encouraging diversity on campus, that is, the diversity of race, of gender, of age, of religion, of sexual orientation, of disability, of lifestyle, and, indeed, of opinion."[16]

The then-recently appointed commissioner of the department of higher education, De Rocco said that he shared the board's belief in the value of diversity. The board:

> actually created its policy regarding acts of racism and intolerance in July 1989. The impetus . . . was both the continuing belief that campuses must be places where civility and equity prevail and the fact that there were reports then of a noticeable, if not dramatic, increase in race-related incidents on college campuses in all sections of the country between 1986 and 1989

---

[16] Andrew G. De Rocco, commissioner, Connecticut Department of Higher Education, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 12 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript). De Rocco's statement and most other statements in this report are from the hearing transcript available in the Eastern Regional Office of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Several statements and additional information are from sources cited in the text and/or in the appropriate footnotes. Many sources are from easily accessible national media accounts.

including in Connecticut.[17]

De Rocco added that during his own presidency at a university in another State a major incident erupted on campus leading to "a deep and important kind of understanding of how these issues manifest themselves." In Connecticut the original policy statement considered for adoption by the board "addressed acts of violence and harassment directed at racial, religious, ethnic, and cultural groups." After it was circulated for review and comment, the "overwhelming recommendation received" led to its being expanded to include protections against discrimination on the bases of gender, sexual orientation, and disabilities.[18] (The final version of the two-page policy statement appears as appendix B.)

According to De Rocco, the board's action "received considerable attention in the media and editorial support generally across the State, and was then reported to be one of the first of its kind in the country."[19] The policy reflected several principles:

> that colleges and universities have a duty to foster tolerance; that the promotion of racial, religious, and ethnic pluralism within higher education is a responsibility both of individuals and of the higher education community in toto; that every person in [the community of] higher education should be treated with dignity and assured security and equality; that individuals may not exercise personal freedom in ways that invade or violate the rights of others. . . . Since [acts of intolerance] are inconsistent with the teaching and values of higher education, individuals who engage in such behavior contradict the ideals and normative standards of a civil college environment.[20]

De Rocco pointed out that under the provisions of the policy, each college and university in Connecticut[21] was required to develop and submit to the board for its review the following plans and procedures:

---

[17] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 13.

[18] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 13-14.

[19] In late 1992, another State higher education official, Assistant Commissioner Valerie F. Lewis, was cited as stating that the Connecticut board "was the first in the Nation to pass a policy requiring colleges to make statements condemning racism, reporting the incidents, and reporting how the statements will be carried out." "Temper Flares on Education Panel," *Hartford Courant*, Dec. 16, 1992, n.p.

[20] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 14-15.

[21] See pp. 88-89 of this report for the discussion by Dr. William Adams, executive assistant to the Wesleyan University president, regarding Wesleyan University's position that it is exempt from the policy.

> First, the plan to promote pluralism, which includes the identification and elimination of practices counter to pluralism. Secondly, a statement condemning racism, intolerance, and other acts of hatred or violence based on such differences. Third, a plan to inform the campus community, including students, faculty and staff, about the statement. Fourth, a plan to educate the campus community about appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. Such a plan should include activities intended to increase sensitivity and awareness, and to encourage the acceptance of others. Fifth, a process to hear and resolve grievances related to this policy in a timely fashion and one which identifies remedies, imposes penalties, up to and including suspension and expulsion.[22]

He stated that the board of governors was still in the process of implementing its policy, which also called for the use of "licensure and accreditation reviews as a means to encourage progress toward these goals, and also for reporting [bias-related] incidents as they occur on the various campuses." He indicated that there remained a need to develop and employ common definitions for reporting incidents that would also "coordinate well with the new requirements for the uniform crime reports that colleges will be obligated to file and share with their campus constituencies annually."[23]

Nonetheless, reports on incidents that had been resolved were periodically filed, were a matter of public record, and could be made available to the Advisory Committee.[24] De Rocco commented:

> It's fair to say that the board is very encouraged by the progress which institutions have made in creating individual policies and plans for the promotion of pluralism. The board may not be as comfortable with the question of licensure and accreditation as an instrument for fostering these ends, particularly in the face of those recent Federal concerns about the appropriateness of these vehicles for enforcing minority and intolerance concerns. As you probably are aware, there have been challenges to the Mid-Central States Association for employing diversity issues as a part of their accreditation.[25]

---

[22] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 15.

[23] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 16.

[24] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 20.

[25] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 19.

De Rocco appeared to have been referring to questions that became public around 1990. For example, a December 1990 *Wall Street Journal* editorial observed that an advisory committee to the U.S. Department of Education had proposed delaying the reauthorization of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools:

> to underscore its objections to the criteria now being used by Middle States. Instead of sticking to matters such as academic standards, library resources, and the like, Middle States has started to use accreditation to enforce its own notions of "social justice." These notions revolve around "multiculturalism," and "diversity," academic code words for racial and sexual preferences and quotas.[26]

In September 1991 the *Washington Post* reported that:

> From [then Education Secretary Lamar] Alexander's perspective, the issue is whether the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools unfairly compels accredited colleges to diversify their students, professors, and trustees based on race, ethnicity, age, and sex. . . .
>
> Middle States officials cast the issue as Alexander's interference with a voluntary academic organization founded in 1887, decades before the Federal Government even offered student aid. They say that seven diversity standards have been applied in a collegial way and reflect a strong consensus of the 505 colleges that Middle States accredits. . . .
>
> Siding with Alexander have been some religious colleges and the conservative National Association of Scholars. Middle States has support from other regional accrediting bodies, such liberal lawmakers as Rep. Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.), and the American Council on Education, an umbrella organization of higher education groups.[27]

In his closing remarks during the Committee's factfinding meeting, De Rocco observed that bias-related incidents on campuses were often viewed as "symptoms of some fundamental failing on the part of our institutions." But De Rocco believed that:

> They are not indications necessarily of our failure; they are in some sense the consequence of our success. We have in fact created environments

---

[26] "Accrediting Quotas," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 14, 1990, editorial page.

[27] Kenneth J. Cooper, "Campus Diversity: Is Education Dept. Interfering on Standards?" *Washington Post*, Sept. 17, 1991, p. A-17. See also Karen DeWitt, "Official Assails College Diversity Rule; Alexander Misunderstands, an Accrediting Agency Says," *New York Times*, Nov. 22, 1991, n.p., and Samuel Weiss, "Under Fire, Accreditors of Colleges Break Ranks," *New York Times*, Feb. 24, 1993, p. A-17.

> within which there is now the potential for dealing functionally and importantly with the deeper causes that separate people, one from another, in their spirit, in their habits, and in their conduct. So in some odd sense we are here today to discuss the success of the system and to see how to promote that success even more effectively.[28]

At the same time, De Rocco questioned whether the campus community had "yet discovered the instrumentalities at institutions to do the fundamental job, to get at the roots of bias, of hatred, of envy, of invidious comparison." He said that pockets or sanctuaries have been created on campus, but he wondered if in promoting such sanctuaries individuals were any longer able to confront one another. "We have before us a remarkable challenge to discover how . . . [to] bring people together. I am not sure I know how to do that."[29]

A related aspect of the task of bringing diverse students together was recently addressed in a March 1994 *Washington Post* article that examined how the pressure to designate some college dormitories for racial or ethnic minorities seemed reflective of a trend toward self-segregation. Having observed several campuses from among Ivy League schools in the northeast to "little-known colleges in the Pacific Northwest," the writer reported that "educators question whether these specialized living arrangments are bringing people together . . . or driving them farther apart."[30]

According to the *Washington Post* writer, a top administrator at Brown University stated that "We don't want to have a Balkanization of the campus," and, therefore, Brown has halted opening any more "theme" houses until their effects have been studied. The administrator believed that "the idea of a university is to have diverse people living and learning together in one community, not 'small enclaves'."[31]

Published Comments by Other State Officials

Two years before the Advisory Committee's meeting, the *New York Times* had focused on the Connecticut Department of Higher Education's efforts to reduce campus tensions, and reported that William A. Bevacqua, of the department's board of governors, stated:

---

[28] De Rocco Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 17.

[29] See also pp. 43-45 of this report regarding "pockets" of "semi-segregated populations" as mentioned by Thomasina Clemons, director of the UCONN office of affirmative action programs, and p. 61 regarding the discussion by Dr. Janina Montero, then dean of university, Wesleyan University, on whether organizations of students of color are a mark of separatism.

[30] Mary Jordan, "College Dorms Reflect Trend of Self-Segregation," *Washington Post*, Mar. 6, 1994, p. A-1 (hereafter cited as "College Dorms Reflect Trend of Self-Segregation").

[31] Ibid.

> It seems racial incidents rise in direct proportion to the amount of time we spend discussing racial policies. We are slapping people on the wrist. . . . Everything we've done thus far hasn't done a darn thing to stop it.[32]

Norma Foreman Glasgow, then Connecticut's commissioner for higher education, observed that racial incidents were becoming increasingly common as campuses recruited more minority students. "If we did not have as many minorities on campus, I would suggest, we would not see as much unrest," stated Glasgow, who, the *New York Times* reported, "has made minority recruiting one of the chief goals of the department."[33]

Apropos of Glasgow's observation about a correlation between the growth in the number of minority students and the rise in the level of campus unrest, the *New York Times* separately noted the earlier observation of a midwestern sociology professor who wrote that "More minorities mean more targets for racial incidents: personal confrontations are more likely to become racial." Perhaps presaging De Rocco's comments above regarding some underlying "success of the system," the same writer also believed that:

> any increase in campus incidents suggests that university administrations are becoming more responsive to minority claims. Historical studies repeatedly show that political protest is most likely when regimes become less repressive, for political activity tends to be as much the product of hope as of need.
>
> . . . [M]ore minority students, self-assured and organized, demanding that responsive administrations end racist conduct that still occurs frequently on their campuses, represents progress, not regression.[34]

Region I Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education

Thomas J. Hibino, Region I Director of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education, explained that OCR is concerned with campus tensions because Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 calls for OCR to enforce the civil rights statutes prohibiting recipients of Federal financial assistance from discriminating on the bases of race, color, and national origin. OCR also enforces legislation prohibiting discrimination on the bases of sex and disability.[35]

---

[32] "Higher Education Board Focuses on Campus Bias," *New York Times*, May 20, 1990, n.p.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Gerald Marwell, professor of sociology, University of Wisconsin/Madison, "What 'Epidemic' of Campus Bigotry?" *New York Times*, May 27, 1988, p. A-31.

Moreover, then-Assistant Secretary of the Office for Civil Rights, Michael Williams, had "set forth racial and sexual harrassment as priority issues," continued Hibinio, and OCR had "taken additional initiatives as opposed to simply reacting to issues as they arise in the region. . . ." OCR had responded to complaints:

> by conducting investigations, by issuing findings of discrimination or no discrimination where none is found, and with the ultimate sanction that we can withhold [U.S. Department of Education funds from] particular institutions who fail to comply with the laws that we enforce.[36]

At the same time, OCR was also interested in "assisting colleges and universities through voluntary means and through technical assistance to try to ensure that the situations do not arise and reach the point where complaints get filed. . . ." OCR could also be of assistance to those developing policies and procedures, such as were described by De Rocco, to combat racial harassment. Thus, said Hibino, he came to learn about the kinds of incidents occurring on campuses in Region I and ascertain whether OCR "can play a role in addressing these tensions and ensuring that we are able to reach the goal . . . of bias-free diversified academic environments."[37]

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Robert Leikind, the director of the Connecticut office of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, began by noting that gays and lesbians on campuses have been among those most adversely affected by prejudice, and they needed representation. Then, commenting from a "larger perspective," Leikind said that:

> America is going through a demographic revolution. . . . We are no longer in the age where we can look at Ozzie and Harriet, or for that matter, the

---

[35] Thomas J. Hibino, Region I Director, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 21, (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[36] Hibino Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 22.

[37] Hibino Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 22-23.

> Cosby family, and say this is the average American family. . . . Changing immigration patterns, changing birth rate patterns are leading to a redefinition of who the average American is, and this is a very American process. . . . [B]y the year 2000, one-third of all Americans will be nonwhite. Other projections say that sometime after the middle of the 21st century, the majority of Americans will be nonwhite.[38]

It might be noted that in March 1993, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported that "The Census Bureau projects that by the middle of the next century, the four major minority groups will together make up nearly half the population."[39] Only a few months earlier, the *Washington Post* had also focused on the Census Bureau's projections, reporting that by the mid-20th century "virtually half of the population will be made up of blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians, and our terminology of 'majority' and 'minority' will become meaningless." Even sooner, "the number of Hispanics will surpass that of blacks in two to three decades."[40]

A special fall 1993 issue of *Time*, entirely devoted to the theme, "The New Face of America: How Immigrants Are Shaping the World's First Multicultural Society," stated that "sometime during the second half of the 21st century, the descendants of white Europeans, the arbiters of the core national culture for most of its existence, are likely to slip into minority status."[41]

During the factfinding meeting, Leikind observed that, just as the Nation has diversified, so, too, have its campuses. "They are not as diverse as the population overall but are diversifying at a substantial rate," and he suggested that "to a considerable extent, this reflects progress that has been achieved over the last number of decades since the beginning of the civil rights revolution. . . ." On the other hand, campus diversity had also led to some "Balkanization . . . defined by racial groups, religious groups, ethnic groups . . . ."[42]

---

[38] Robert Leikind, director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Connecticut Office, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 24 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[39] "Conflicts Over Census Mirror Struggles in Society at Large," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Mar. 24, 1993, p. A-8.

[40] Barbara Vobejda, "Births, Immigration Revise Census View of 21st Century U.S.," *Washington Post*, Dec. 4, 1992, p. A-10. See also, Robert Pear, "New Look at the U.S. in 2050: Bigger, Older, and Less White," *New York Times*, Dec. 4, 1992.

[41] "America's Immigrant Challenge," *Time*, fall 1993, p. 5.

[42] See also, "College Dorms Reflect Trend of Self-Segregation."

Problems of noncriminal harassment and hate crime have also surfaced, and some controversy has arisen over "questions [about] the suitability of traditional curriculum."[43]

According to Leikind, the various problems were not necessarily bad, though "almost inevitable. . . . The real question is: How do we deal with them? . . . We need to avoid simple solutions because these are not simple problems." He observed that:

> Our campuses are filled today with people who come from relatively homogeneous environments, who come to campus and for the first time are exposed to people on a regular basis who are very different from themselves. . . . Many students come emotionally and intellectually ill-equipped to deal with the issues of diversity that they find. And they are left trying to understand people who are different from themselves, and they have only the stereotypes that they have learned of these people. The impact on the campus community can be one of demoralization and undermining of a healthy learning environment.[44]

Thus, "diversity programming" was crucial, maintained Leikind, "especially when you are dealing with freshmen [who may arrive on campus] simply ill-equipped to deal with what they are going to be living in." He believed "it is unfair to ask them to assume the responsibility without some encouragement and training, literally."[45] He also said that multicultural education must be an integral part of "the campus environment" and that campuses must assume "leadership in providing these opportunities. . . . Corporations around the country do it; campuses should not do less."[46]

A year later, a guest columnist addressed an aspect of the problem on the weekly "My Turn" page of a May 1993 issue of *Newsweek*. The columnist, a white high school junior, wrote about the self-segregated environment at his school and how it even separated him from a black student, his onetime childhood friend. He was critical of his school, for:

> In its effort to put students through as many academic classes as possible and prepare them for college, my school seems to have overlooked one crucial course: teaching black and white students how to get along,

---

[43] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 25-26.

[44] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 26-27.

[45] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 35.

[46] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 29. For what corporations are doing, see also Frederick R. Lynch, "Manager's Journal: Multiculturalism Comes to the Workplace," *Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 26, 1992, p. A-16.

> which in my opinion, would be more valuable than all the others.[47]

Having experienced a consciously integrated environment at a summer camp, the young guest columnist concluded that:

> Schools need to make it a real priority to involve whites and blacks together as much as possible. This would mean more multicultural activities, mandatory classes that teach black history and discussions of today's racial controversies. Teachers should mix whites and blacks more in study groups so they have to work together in and out of school. (Students won't do it on their own.)[48]

Apropos of the high schooler's comments above were the comments of the principal of a Connecticut high school in Hartford, as reported by the *New York Times* in February 1993. According to the principal, his school has attempted to:

> reinforce the cultural identity of [its] students, 94 percent of whom are black. "Roots" is part of African studies courses. Posters everywhere emphasize black accomplishments. The black anthem, "Lift Every Voice and Sing," is sung at assemblies.
>
> "I think we're providing an adequate education to prepare them to live in their own community," [the principal] said. "I'm not so sure about the world beyond."[49]

As to Leikind's suggestion that some corporations have shown leadership by already beginning to accommodate diversity or multiculturalism, it may be useful to refer to a February 1994 article in the monthly *Education Digest* that asserted that:

> In the nineteenth century, schools as institutions were modeled largely on factories. Most school children, like factory products, were placed in groups [and] taught as groups. . . . Today, most progressive corporations have become automated and moved from the "factory model" of production to "total quality management," which encourages and rewards individual initiative, creativity, and achievement. . . . [W]hile industry has gone beyond perceiving workers as members of a class, many schools today remain locked in that earlier vision. They continue to "package" students into tracks, ignore

---

[47] Brian Jarvis, "Against the Great Divide," *Newsweek*, May 3, 1993, p. 14 (hereafter cited as "Against the Great Divide"). See also the discussion by UCONN student Marcia Kaiser, p. 28.

[48] "Against the Great Divide."

[49] George Judson, "Hartford Schools Molded by Racial Isolation," *New York Times*, Feb. 13, 1993, p. A-26 (hereafter cited as "Hartford Schools Molded by Racial Isolation).

> individual learning styles, and generally overlook related individual differences.[50]

Thus, the author of the *Education Digest* article, while respecting the goals of multiculturalism, cautioned against the dangers of losing sight of the student's identity as an individual and seeing the student solely in the context of his or her cultural group. As Leikind had called for educators to emulate those corporations that were already acknowledging the needs of a diverse or multicultural work force, the *Education Digest* author used the corporate analogy to urge educators to protect and enhance the specific identity of each student while still recognizing that student's group or cultural heritage.

Leikind reported that at an ADL conference, held just a few weeks earlier for Jewish students from campuses around Connecticut, one phenomenon that became evident was the "discomfort that many of them felt in asserting a Jewish identity on campus." He acknowledged that many Jewish students have the option of disguising their identity by hiding behind the color of their skin, something that not all minorities can do. Still, many Jewish students "were overtly uncomfortable" when a speaker with "a long record of rather extreme anti-Semitic statements" came to their campus for "a highly publicized event."

Despite a general hesitation to draw attention to themselves as Jews, said Leikind, a Jewish student group did approach other student groups about the event, asking them:

> to join in a protest. Not a single one would join. The reasons were complex, having to do with the environment on campus, the, in my view, ambivalence of the administration, and the difficulty in dealing with a potentially difficult issue. The result was that these [Jewish] students became demoralized, frightened, and deeply, deeply discouraged.[51]

Leikind described another example involving a:

> speaker with a long record of anti-Semitic rantings. He is a member of a popular rap group, and came to another college in Connecticut last year. At that time he was supposed to talk about lyrical criticism in music. He spent 20 minutes of that time talking about the Jewish conspiracy against African Americans and included such comments as Jewish doctors injecting black babies with the AIDS virus. At the end of this speech—there were about 80 students in the audience—according to one witness, the speaker received a

---

[50] Francis J. Ryan, "Will Multiculturalism Undercut Student Individuality?" *Education Digest*, February 1994, p. 28.

[51] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 27-28.

standing ovation from the students who were present.[52]

The speaker's visit had been financed by student activities funds, according to Leikind, and when the student activities office was subsequently asked about the situation, a person there responded that "he thought that the people were being overly sensitive." Leikind referred to this example because "the issue of sensitivity, the issue of leadership on the part of the administration, and the need to bring people together is crucial." At the same time, "easy solutions, such as censoring a paid speech—which we as an organization would oppose—have to be avoided."[53]

On the question of censorship, a columnist in a February 1994 edition of *Newsweek* cited the approach taken by a New England college president who was faced with the controversy surrounding a book recently published by a faculty member. The book reportedly attacked Jews and their sympathizers who had criticized the faculty member for having used a particular document in class. Among other claims, the document asserted that 75 percent of urban Jews in the antebellum South owned slaves. Addressing the controversy, the college president made:

> a useful distinction between a decision to *censor* [the faculty member] (prevent him from speaking) which she rejects, and a decision to *censure* (strongly criticize) him, which she undertook in an open letter to the entire . . . campus and [its] alumnae.[54]

The *Newsweek* columnist applauded the college president's action, adding "Fight speech with more speech. It's often that simple."[55]

In the factfinding meeting, Leikind reported that ADL has maintained data on anti-Semitic incidents throughout the Nation and that incidents occurred on five Connecticut campuses in the previous year. He noted that, though it seemed possible for the acts to have been random and committed by only a limited number of individuals:

> what is very clear is that the response of the administration and the campus community to these events can have a profound impact upon how comfort-

---

[52] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 28.

[53] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 29.

[54] Jonathan Alter, "On Hate: Censure, Not Censor," *Newsweek*, Feb. 14, 1994, p. 48. Italics appear in the original.

[55] Ibid.

> able, how at home, how safe students feel. . . . And in all instances, possibly except one, the campus administrators I spoke to were concerned about issues of intolerance on campus. How quickly they moved varied. But there was an overwhelming concern with this problem. We were pleased, frankly.[56]

ADL had not been in contact with the Connecticut Board of Higher Education at the time of the incidents, but Leikind recalled that, when he later was "in touch with the administrations of the particular campuses," one of the questions raised of ADL was:

> "Are you asking that we censor who comes on campus and who doesn't?" [ADL's] response has been, "No, we don't think that that is appropriate in a university environment." However, there is another question as to whether or not one actually facilitates or endorses extremist speakers who come on campus, or for that matter, whether the administration takes a position when an incident happens. We have encouraged campus officials that they do not have to be indifferent. It would be appropriate for them to take a position, for example, not to spend student activities money on an extremist speaker when they come onto a campus. I do not know if we have persuaded anybody.[57]

Queried as to whether freedom of speech and freedom of access might be allowed to all people or whether a speaker voicing antipathy toward any group should be barred if violence or campus disruption could be foreseen, Leikind responded by posing the question: How would one obtain "clear evidence that a particular form of speech is going to result in violence?" In a situation:

> where we simply don't like what someone is saying, I think the problem is, who decides? Who decides what it is that we don't like? Who decides what it is that is offensive? We run into a very steep, slippery slope here.[58]

For this reason, Leikind emphasized that:

> the key issue is for administration and student leaders to show leadership and not sit on the fence for fear of alienating one constituency or another. Where there is a hate group that is coming on campus, it is the responsibility of the administration to respond to the sensibilities of the students who are with certainty going to be offended. . . .

---

[56] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 28.

[57] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 34.

[58] Leikind Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 36.

> The other thing is, one does not have to roll out a red carpet. One does not have to spend student activities money on it. That's a different thing than censorship. Saying we are not welcoming someone is different from saying we are going to prevent them from speaking.[59]

Hillel Foundation

David M. Silver, the director of the Hillel Foundation, said that Hillel is the umbrella organization serving Jewish students, faculty, and staff at institutions of higher education across the Nation. There are 400 Hillel Foundations around the world. He reported that at Yale University in early April 1992, a conference was organized for Connecticut Hillels, and the participants came from the University of Connecticut, Connecticut College, the University of Hartford, Trinity University, Wesleyan University, and Yale University.[60]

Well attended, the conference was meant to foster networking among the students, said Silver, adding that "with anti-Semitism growing worldwide, but particularly at universities, never has the need for a Jewish presence on campus been greater." He noted that one of the basic building blocks in the Jewish tradition was the "idea of community; the idea of being Jewish in a vacuum is kind of anathema to Jewish tradition." Thus, the conference provided the students an opportunity to meet each other and discuss the issues and dilemmas facing them on their campuses.

Silver also commented on the situation at UCONN/Storrs which he saw as a "very unique community for Jewish students." A self-contained land grant school located beyond a major urban area, UCONN served about 1,200 Jewish students who have found themselves distant from the Jewish community. Silver said that Jewish students at UCONN had "to be very strong with a very good inner sense of strength in terms of his or her own Jewish identity, when you don't have that large community around you and you encounter [problems of bias and harrassment]." In such a setting, Hillel has become a place "where students and staff can come and worship together, learn together, socialize as Jewish people, but also to monitor and react to [problems] together."[61]

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] David M. Silver, director, Hillel Foundation, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 30 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[61] Silver Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 30-32.

Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education

> (Dr. Grissel Benitez-Hodge, then president of the Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education, was invited to address the factfinding meeting, accepted the invitation, but mistook the date. On June 3, 1993, her successor as president, Dr. Fay A. Miller, provided the brief statement summarized below.)

Dr. Fay A. Miller, the president of the Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education (CALAHE), explained that CALAHE, a nonprofit organization, was dedicated to promoting the full participation of Hispanic students, staff, faculty, and administrators in all areas of higher education. CALAHE has worked with organizations such as African Americans in Higher Education in Connecticut and the Congress of Latin American Students "to improve the status of racial and ethnic people of color in higher education" in the State by sponsoring college fairs and working with the leadership of several campuses to increase representation of Latinos on their campuses.[62]

A major CALAHE activity has been its annual conference. In April 1993 the 14th annual conference focused on the "Educational Future of Hispanic Youth: A Call for Action." Miller said that through the presentations and workshops it became clear that "while there has been some progress and there are some programs in place at various institutions, there is still work to be done." She pointed out that Hispanics in Connecticut "represent approximately 6.5 percent of the population, yet in 1991, they were only 3.3 percent of the college student population, which is down from the 3.6 percent of 1990." She added that more than half of the Hispanic students entering college were enrolled in 2-year institutions and not 4-year institutions.

Miller reported that some of the workshop recommendations called for:

> 1) diversification of the curricula in order to validate and make visible the contributions of Hispanics; 2) education of non-Hispanic faculty and staff, in non-threatening ways, of multicultural issues; and 3) use of consistency in systems of reward and disciplinary actions.[63]

---

[62] Statement attached to a letter from Fay A. Miller, president, Connecticut Association of Latin American in Higher Education, to Tino Calabia, Commission Officer, Eastern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, June 3, 1993.

[63] Ibid.

International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators

[Jeffrey T. Wilcox, the board secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Law Enforcement Administrators, which is headquartered in Hartford, was invited to address the factfinding meeting, accepted the invitation, but did not appear. The association was invited to provide a statement but has not done so.]

III. UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

> [W]e have to look at multiculturalism not [as an answer to] the Latinos' problems, the African Americans' problems, or the minorities' problems, but to the problems of all of us. It is not for the African American Cultural Center to deal with multiculturalism; it's for all of us to deal with.
>
> *Marcia Kaiser*, Student
> University of Connecticut

> People talk about prejudice and discrimination as though these were really at the core of the problem. Yet we know that the polls show that attitudes of prejudice have plummeted over the last 20 years. We are not talking just about prejudice. We are talking about racism. We are talking about a phenomenon that is also built into a structure.
>
> *Ronald L. Taylor*, Professor
> University of Connecticut

UCONN STUDENT PANEL

UCONN Undergraduate Student Government

Christopher P. Long, the past president of the UCONN undergraduate student government whose term expired the week prior to the factfinding meeting, had attended UCONN for 5 years and said that "I have seen a lot in those 5 years regarding the issues that we are addressing today." He stated that:

> I think racial tension does definitely exist on the University of Connecticut campus. Why? Because it exists in society at large. And it is especially difficult for a campus community to take care of this situation once and for all because it has such a transient population.[64]

Moreover, as Leikind had observed, students have come from relatively homogeneous communities to a very diverse community, said Long, and:

> oftentimes they have trouble dealing with this. What the university is trying

---

[64] Christopher P. Long, past president, UCONN undergraduate student government, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 40-41 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

> to do is very commendable since it is trying to change an attitude that has existed with an individual since birth oftentimes.[65]

Long was convinced that UCONN was committed to multiculturalism and remembered his first meeting with President Hartley the previous summer. One of Hartley's top priorities was "the multicultural agenda," and Hartley had emphasized multiculturalism "even in these troubled economic times, which I think was definitely commendable."

He noted that he had been "exposed to the multicultural agenda," as had many of his classmates, and the results were "very positive, because I think we are very sensitive to the needs of traditionally underrepresented students." At the same time, he considered the question of the effectiveness of "the techniques that the university is using right now" as "open to a lot of debate," which he thought the other student panelists would discuss. In any case, he believed that "some improvements need to be made." The programs that UCONN was attempting to organize have been hindered "because there's no money to fund those programs, and there's no money to really investigate new solutions."[66]

Moreover, tuition costs have increased, and at schools where "tuition is rising at an astronomical rate, I think that creates a real problem for already underrepresented students," Long stated. On this score, a *New York Times* article cited earlier reported that tuition and other college costs have more than doubled in only 5 years and that the Connecticut legislature had slashed State assistance to UCONN "by $47.5 million over the last 4 years."[67]

Long said that despite rising costs at UCONN, Hartley has maintained multiculturalism as a priority and has spoken about the Asian Cultural Center and the Institute for African American Studies, and yet "tensions are high, and many say that the tensions have been increasing." To deal with the situation, "students are trying to come together . . . to provide leadership," Long continued, citing the United Front program in the African American Cultural Center. That program started as a coalition of cultural groups that formed on their own initiative "to talk about some common agenda for multicultural understanding, . . . an excellent step in the right direction."[68]

As for the undergraduate student government, "we are trying to help facilitate this understanding as the umbrella organization for all undergraduates," said Long. For example, it has tried to promote understanding by helping:

---

[65] Ibid.

[66] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 41-43.

[67] "At UCONN, Costs Squeeze Its Students . . . .," pp. 2, 42.

[68] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 43.

> the university senate put together a program whereby students entering a freshman English course would have the option of taking a freshman English course that was multicultural intensive. . . . This past year, we have worked with the United States Student Association and lobbied in Washington for increased help with scholarships to traditionally underrepresented students. . . . Both in Washington and in Hartford [the undergraduate student government] has fought for a larger budget for higher education affiliates nationwide. . . . Also we have put together a Student Bill of Rights and set the groundwork for students to govern themselves entirely in the future.[69]

Long then described what he thought might have been "the most dramatic example" of the student government's efforts along these lines. A few weeks previous to the fact-finding meeting, it passed "a resolution on understanding." The context involved a member of the administration who had allegedly made comments potentially offensive to international students. The student government then urged the international students "to fight for their rights and to investigate the issue and encouraged all students in turn to try to investigate these issues and promote some understanding and reach some consensus."[70]

The student government has also funded campus cultural groups, continued Long.

> They come to us for funding, and we try to help them with their programs. We try to help them advertise. Unfortunately . . . the campus does not attend these programs in as large a number as they should. And just like the university should reevaluate its implementation of the multicultural agenda, I would invite all groups, all cultural groups, to investigate ways to promote understanding on this campus, to find ways to creatively advertise what they are doing.[71]

Long also mentioned the President's Council which the student government created "to help facilitate discussion between major cultural organizations and all the major groups on campus." The council demonstrates two things:

> how prominent those cultural groups are on campus because all the major cultural groups were included in the President's Council, and also that the

---

[69] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 45.

[70] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 45-46. Also, see discussion by a UCONN international student on pp. 34-35.

[71] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 46.

> students have a commitment to helping each other and providing leadership for the university.[72]

In closing, Long said that the priority attention being given to the problem of bias represents "a good response to a potentially volatile situation. However, I think our implementation . . . needs to be investigated. We have to see where we are going with this, and we have to sort of help it through its adolescence." He added that in general:

> universities are really investigating [the problem. But] . . . . nationwide, I think we're a bit behind the eight-ball. Many of these problems have sort of crept up on us, whether by fate or just the fact that we have chosen to ignore them for so long. So I think tensions are high and that we are at a crucial stage right now. We really have to make some time up but also prepare for the future.
>
> Today is a wonderful way to begin, at least for the undergraduate student government. Hopefully we can take care of the budget problems, but also put this on our priority list. Talks like this are necessary, and dialogue is certainly essential. . . . The only way to end ignorance is through education. Hopefully higher education in America can help end this ignorance and promote understanding for the entire nation.[73]

Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center Advisory Board

Yvette Martinez, chairperson of the advisory board to the Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center, explained that the basic objective of the center is "to promote Latino education and promote the experience of our culture." The center has existed for over 20 years and has offered seminars, lectures, and videos, as well as social activities.

She agreed with Long that racial tensions have increased over the past 5 years. Like Long, she also observed that the center's programs have not been publicized or reported upon by the *Daily Campus*, UCONN's newspaper.

> [A]nnually for Latino Awareness Month, which is the month of April, reports on our activities and so forth have not been done. And it is something that we, the students, individuals, Latino individuals, have written articles, editorials, and so forth, trying to attack this issue, trying to get the

---

[72] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 46.

[73] Long Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 47, 63.

> campus to promote our cultural events. . . .[74]

As Hartley had mentioned, Martinez also said that the center has been working "with the university on trying to install the Institute for Puerto Rican/Latino Studies, and we are in the process right now of seeking a director for that program." She added that Latinos have been pressing for such an institute for over 20 years, and "finally it is coming to a reality." Martinez submitted numerous documents for the record, including news articles going back to 1975 describing complaints made by Puerto Rican students and staff.

An October 11, 1975, *Willimantic Chronicle* article reported on the spring 1974 formation of the Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs and Studies that had been organized to protest "the university's alleged failure to hire Puerto Rican professionals and to provide a program of Puerto Rican studies."[75] Ten days later, the *Hartford Courant* reported that the committee had sent a list of 14 demands to then-UCONN president Glenn W. Ferguson that included demands for two new positions to allow for the hiring of an administrative assistant on Spanish-speaking affairs and a Spanish-speaking adviser in the college of liberal arts and sciences, and a demand for "increased representation of people experienced in Puerto Rican affairs in UCONN's central administration." The same article noted that the committee had been informed by the institution's equal employment opportunities officer that only "six-tenths of 1 percent of the workforce is Hispanic."[76]

In terms of sensitivity to other cultures and awareness about racism, Martinez stated that "there are definitely problems that have existed with the administration and students, and I think this is something that is due to ignorance and can only be solved through education." She noted that Latinos have had to explain to others that "within the Latino culture there is lots of diversity, and I think that many students do not understand that." For example, at a conference on the Saturday before the factfinding meeting, some Latinos mentioned that:

> many times in courses, when people find out that a student has a Latino surname, [the Latino] is asked, "Oh, well, do you speak Puerto Rican, or do you speak Latino?" And then in turn the student has to respond, "Well, no,

---

[74] Yvette Martinez, chairperson, Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center Advisory Board, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 50 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[75] Janice Gould, "Puerto Rican Unit Asks UCONN Changes," *Willimantic Chronicle*, Oct. 11, 1975, p. 1. See also Terese Karmel, "Group Says UCONN Slights Hispanics," *Hartford Courant*, Oct. 12, 1975, p. 24.

[76] Terese Karmel, "UCONN Hispanics List 14 Demands," *Hartford Courant*, Oct. 21, 1975, p. 10.

> you know, there is no such thing as speaking Puerto Rican; it's speaking Spanish."[77]

At the same time, she acknowledged that:

> as a Latino, it's very easy for you to mingle within the mainstream. You can either recognize your culture, or you can choose not to. And those who do recognize it are faced with the struggle of trying to educate others for reasons why they chose to recognize their culture.[78]

In any case, Martinez also indicated that there was insufficient representation of Latinos on the faculty, with just one Puerto Rican professor in the history department, and "as far as administration and staff goes, there's a few others, but not many." One of the documents submitted by her was the 24-page "Report of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Studies," issued September 4, 1991. Extrapolating from the 1990 census and subsequent figures calculated by the Census Bureau as corrections for the undercount in the 1990 census, the provost's advisory committee stated in its report that "If UCONN were to obtain a representation of Puerto Rican and Latino faculty similar to their proportion in the State's population, it would have to hire 50 additional Puerto Rican faculty members and fill 23 additional positions with non-Puerto Rican Latino scholars."[79]

Nonetheless, according to Martinez, it was still possible for multiculturalism to exist at UCONN since:

> the resources are there. There are different cultural centers. There are different organizations. If we work together as a group, we can come together to form this multicultural environment that we are so much struggling to have. Along with the rest of the cultural institutes at UCONN, the Latino community feels [it would be helpful to have] some kind of multicultural affairs provost. . . or unit to which the different cultural organizations on campus would report. That is still, I guess, on the table. Because of the budget cuts and so forth, it is very difficult to try to get anything new right now at UCONN, but hopefully that will come very soon.[80]

She further emphasized that:

---

[77] Martinez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 64.

[78] Martinez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 65.

[79] Provost's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Studies, *Report of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Studies*, Sept. 4, 1991, pp. 4-5.

[80] Martinez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 49.

> Latino students as well as African American and Asian American students are feeling the tensions more so today than [before] . . . but it's very difficult [to get their voices heard] when there is so few of us, and with tuition increasing, there will be even fewer in the years to come.[81]

African American Cultural Center Advisory Board

Marcia Kaiser, a board member of the African American Cultural Center Advisory Board, noted that 21 years ago Martin Luther King, Jr., stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial and:

> set forth his dream of racial harmony. To those in academia, the dream did not seem far. Yet today, our educational institutions are called upon to explain the recent rise in racial tensions on America's campuses. My university, the University of Connecticut, has the resources and individuals to bring about a kind of diversity. I think the problem is how those resources and individuals are used.[82]

For example, Kaiser reported that when she first entered UCONN there was a 6-week summer program under the Center for Academic Progress. The majority of the participants were minority students, and as part of the program there was a required course on racism. "Our advisors would tell us that this [course] would help us combat racism on our campus," continued Kaiser. She and others:

> found it ironic that here we have a wonderful course taught by an outstanding professor, Ronald Taylor. It was on racism and was taught only to minorities—mandatory for minorities—teaching us how to combat racism on our campus. It seems, and recent events show us, that our community at large needs to take this course as well.[83]

Kaiser explained that during the regular school year the course was not offered. Though Taylor has taught a different course on race and racism in the school year, it was not mandatory nor was it the same as the summer course she had described.[84]

---

[81] Martinez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 49-50.

[82] Marcia Kaiser, board member, African American Cultural Center Advisory Board, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 50 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[83] Kaiser Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 51.

She observed that:

> Our campus prides itself on its strict policies, but the policies do not promote multiculturalism. They only deal with the backlash of not promoting diversity. I believe it's time for action. . . . The campus must make assertive efforts. A multicultural community does not exist merely based on the presence of a diversity of academic disciplines and organizations, but when diversity is integrated into every phase of university life.[85]

More recently, a November 1993 article in the monthly *Education Digest* touched upon how some campuses react to bias-related incidents. Almost as Kaiser had observed about her campus, the article suggested that "We react belatedly to [incidents] because we have not developed a comprehensive strategy for building diversity."[86] Again, apropos of how Kaiser described UCONN's situation, the article went on to state that "Rather than cordoning off issues of multiculturalism as the sole responsibility of a select few, an institution that honors diversity will make multiculturalism a central task of all."[87]

During the factfinding meeting, Kaiser stated:

> I'm amazed at the resources that our university has and the amount of ignorance that is unaffected by those resources. I can't express to you how many late night sessions have arisen among study groups when we end up talking about minorities and what's going on on campus. I have many students ask me "Why is there a black history month? Why is it necessary?" Students ask me how I comb my hair, or, if I go out in the sun, will I really tan?
>
> I've had a professor say to me, "You should understand where we're coming from. You're from Simsbury, a suburb; you're not like those others," or they say, "you know, the colored people." I thought that term was long thrown away by those in institutions of higher education.[88]

---

[84] See p. 53 for a more detailed discussion of the regular school year course offered by Professor Ronald Taylor, UCONN department of sociology.

[85] Kaiser Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 51.

[86] Estela M. Bensimon, William G. Tierney, "Shaping the Multicultural College Campus," *Education Digest*, November 1993, p. 67.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Kaiser Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 51.

Kaiser suggested that the lack of knowledge and lack of tolerance was "very dangerous on our campus." She felt ambivalent about "how to deal with this, because you look at somebody and say, 'They just really don't know. They really have not been educated in their high schools.'" She believed that the higher education community:

> owes it to these students to educate them, to teach them what multiculturalism really is. We obviously realize that there is no such thing as the melting pot, because some of us don't really melt in. So it's time to educate the students. It's time to take action.
>
> I think we are headed in the right direction. We are talking about multicultural affairs. We have decided we're going to find a director. But a director without a structure does not do us much good. And we have to look at multiculturalism not [as an answer to] the Latinos' problems, the African Americans' problems, or the minorities' problems, but to the problems of all of us. It is not for the African American Cultural Center to deal with multiculturalism; it's for all of us to deal with.[89]

Asian American Association

Peter Y. Wan, the president of the Asian American Association, noted that this was "my first time ever in speaking out and giving my personal experience dealing with racism." He agreed to appear because he felt compelled to urge the Advisory Committee to recognize the severity and the frequency of racism faced by Asian Americans. He believed that for too long Asian Americans have been ignored and treated unequally. "America recognizes the difficulties and the racial bias faced by many minority groups. But . . . America does not recognize the racial bias and the difficulties faced by the Asian American community."[90]

American society has begun to educate itself about different minorities and their cultures and has started to "demystify the language, the images, and the stereotypes" society has employed against minorities, said Wan. But society has continued to foster images about Asian Americans that have led to anti-Asian bigotry ranging "from name-calling on a regular basis to violent physical crimes leading to murder," as in the June 1982 killing of Vincent Chin, the Chinese American beaten to death by two resentful, laid off auto workers who mistook Chin for Japanese.[91]

---

[89] Kaiser Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 52-53.

[90] Peter Y. Wan, president, Asian American Association, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 53, (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

Wan also summarized a December 1987 incident at UCONN when a Marta Ho and seven other UCONN students of Asian descent:

> were harassed and spat upon continuously [in a UCONN schoolbus] while going to a semiformal. During the harassment, no students made an attempt to stop the harassment. Some observed. Some even laughed.[92]

Several newspapers detailed the incident, and a one-page summary appeared in the May 23, 1988, *New Haven Advocate* that also reported subsequent allegations of incidents at UCONN in which Asian Americans were victimized; the same article mentioned the general problem affecting other Asian American students and faculty across the Nation.[93]

A longer study of the incident, the family background of Ho, one of the victims, steps that two victims took afterwards, and UCONN's short-term and longer term responses appeared in the November 26, 1989 *Northeast*, the Sunday magazine of the *Hartford Courant*.[94] Journalist David Morse, author of the magazine article, appeared at a UCONN panel discussion during Metanoia week in April 1990 and was reported as stating that in researching his article on UCONN "he found 'the extraordinary inability of an institution to look at itself.'"[95]

During the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting, Wan charged that the Vincent Chin case and the UCONN/Storrs case demonstrated:

> the lack of seriousness and the insincerity of the authorities in handling cases. Both cases also exemplify in detail the open and tolerated racism and the frequency with which this racism occurs against Asian Americans.[96]

---

[91] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 53-54.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Kevin Kleinbardt, "Racism's Latest Victims; Asian American Students Are Having a Tough Time at UCONN and Elsewhere Across the Country," *New Haven Advocate*, May 23, 1988, p. 6.

[94] David Morse, "Prejudicial Studies: One Astounding Lesson for the University of Connecticut," *Northeast/Hartford Courant*, Nov. 26, 1989, pp. 10-32.

[95] Lisa Hayden, "Racism Won't Go Away by Itself," *Norwich Bulletin*, Apr. 5, 1990, n.p.

[96] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 54.

Although he had arrived in America 13 years earlier, Wan said that he still felt unwelcome, having seen America ignoring Asian Americans and being insensitive and unfair to them. As an elementary school student, he watched a cartoon depicting a caricature of an Asian with "funny looking eyes, buck-tooth, bald head with a braided pigtail in back . . . who frequently made utterances such as 'Ah-so.'" Afterward Wan's classmates made fun of Wan by mimicking the looks and language of that cartoon character.

He also remembered being harassed by his classmates in the hallways and "being punished by the school because I could not speak English well enough to tell them I was being picked on." In history class he was "told to go back to my own country and to learn my own history. I remember the teacher and students laughing." He recalled getting into frequent fights, yet trying to keep his "parents away from school because I was afraid that they would also be laughed at and made fun of."[97]

In elementary and middle school, he reported many such acts, "but justice was not served," stated Wan. School administrators could not believe that such incidents had occurred and "pretty much . . . denied" that they did, letting things just quiet down. Because of his experiences and his fear that he would be treated as if he had made the stories up, "ever since high school I have never bothered reporting" incidents.[98]

Wan said that once he had wanted:

> to hit everyone in sight, but instead, I started screaming, hitting lockers, until my fist started to bleed. I remember being spit upon, called a "chink" while going to class in high school. I remember my first semester at UCONN. I was afraid on Thursday nights to go back to my room because I didn't want to hear or answer phone calls from my roomate and his drinking buddies, making racial slurs such as "chink," and threatening to kill me if I don't go back to my own country. I was also told by dorm mates that I was being insensitive, and I didn't know how to take a joke.[99]

At the same time, Wan stated that many schools and universities, such as UCONN, have begun to "condemn and punish violators of racial crimes. [But after] punishment, these people will only build up more hatred . . . . We must intiate and provide programs to educate. . . . We cannot sit and wait for problems to solve themselves, because delayed time is destructive."[100]

---

[97] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 54-55.

[98] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 66.

[99] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 55-56.

Wan also pointed out that Asian Americans constituted the largest minority group at UCONN but still had no cultural center and no studies program. However, a year after the Committee's factfinding meeting, the *Hartford Courant* reported that the Asian American Cultural Center referred to by Wan was opened with a full-time director and an annual budget of about $130,000.[101] According to the *Hartford Courant*, the president of the United Asian Council "traced the demand for a cultural center to December 3, 1987, the night several Asian Americans were spat upon and taunted by white students on a bus ride to an off-campus dance,"[102] as Wan had described above.

During the factfinding meeting, Wan stated that UCONN administrators had made commitments to start a cultural program and a studies program, "but more needs to be done." Besides, it seemed to Wan unfair that the burden of educating others had to fall upon the individual student who already had to handle his or her academic workload as well as cope with social problems.[103]

At the same time, Wan acknowledged, as Long had also mentioned, that all of the UCONN cultural organizations have linked up to form the United Front, which Wan described as "a collective effort to battle racism and to try to create better understanding on the UCONN campus." He did not think that one incident could be viewed as offensive to African American students and a different incident as offensive to Latino students. Thus, the various cultural organizations have been attempting to:

> approach these issues together, not just because it is a Latino thing, or an African American thing, or an Asian American thing, but because we all feel that [something] affecting one group affects also ourselves directly or indirectly.[104]

UCONN Hillel Student Council

Steven H. Schneider, the president of the Hillel Student Council and a junior, explained that although Hillel was intended to serve the needs of Jewish students, he had come not just for Jewish students but also for students of all religions, all colors and ethnic backgrounds, and both sexes. Throughout his schooling he had witnessed "various acts of anti-Semitism, bigotry, racism and sexism." However, since he was representing Jewish students, he offered two examples of anti-Jewish discrimination.

---

[100] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 56-57.

[101] "UCONN Opens Asian America Student Center," *Hartford Courant*, Apr. 9, 1993, p. A-1 and p. A-6.

[102] Ibid.

[103] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 57.

[104] Wan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 67-68.

One involved the UCONN Student Board of Governors, which had invited a former member of a rap group who, according to Schneider, was a known anti-Semite. The invitee was expected to speak about music censorship. But he had previously been reported as claiming that "Jews are the reason for wickedness in the world. Jewish doctors infected African babies with the AIDS virus," said Schneider who could not believe that the Student Board of Governors would have invited such a person. Assisted by the ADL and supported by community leaders, Hillel "held a rally not to demonstrate against [the invitee's] right to speak but to educate people about his statements. We received tremendous support through the press and the campus community."[105]

The second example occurred in Schneider's own residence hall. An outsider had come onto the UCONN campus and surreptitiously scribbled profanity on the floor housing women students. Schneider said that the words read, "Death to all blacks. Death to all Jews. Heil Hitler!" A swastika was also drawn. Though Schneider had read about neo-Nazism and about revisionists who argued that the Jewish holocaust never occurred, "this incident still shocked me and left me hurt. I remained silent, maybe out of fear, or maybe out of disgust. But now I face this with all of you." He added that 2 years earlier he had attended an ADL-sponsored conference on combating anti-Jewish discrimination on college campuses, and he had then been "under the impression that this would never happen at UCONN."[106]

Schneider also mentioned that the Hillels throughout Connecticut have held conferences every semester on dealing with:

> issues of racism, anti-Semitism, and bigotry. But this is not enough. ADL does a great deal, too. But how can this problem be solved without all groups of every race, religion, gender, and ethnic background coming together? I feel the problem needs to be addressed by the President of the United States. If President Bush is the education president, I challenge him

---

[105] Steven H. Schneider, president, Hillel Student Council, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 57-58 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[106] Schneider Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 58-59.

to start educating people about the "melting pot" we live in.

In addition, Schneider believed that:

> colleges across the Nation need to start an organization that encourages communication among students of different races, religions, gender, and ethnic backgrounds. Another possible solution . . . is to require all college students to take a course about racism, bigotry, anti-Semitism, and sexism. . . . We must do this not just for Jewish people, but for all people.[107]

Intercultural Federation

Shariq Chhapra said that he was an undergraduate and a member of the Intercultural Federation, the student advisory board to the UCONN Department of International Services and Programs. He stated that the main goal of the board was to promote racial and cultural exchanges between students and to ensure that the programs of the department were in "the best interests of foreign and U.S. citizens."[108]

Over recent months, the federation had engaged in discussions regarding racial incidents on campus ranging from issues of housing, admissions, and ethnic and racial disputes. Chhapra noted that the *Daily Campus* had spotlighted cases of a racial nature, the "two most striking" involving the International Undergraduate Student Committee (IUSC) on one side and the Division of Student Affairs and Services (DSAS) on the other over the settlement of a racial dispute between a resident assistant and a student.

In the first case, the IUSC was appointed by the UCONN office of the provost to make recommendations regarding the admission of international undergraduates. However, the IUSC became "deadlocked following an allegation of racial bias from one of its members." Shocked by the seriousness of the charge and by the way it was being handled, the Intercultural Federation brought up the matter with both the office of the provost and the office of the president. "After careful consideration, the president took the matter into his own hands by restructuring the IUSC," said Chhapra.[109]

---

[107] Schneider Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 60.

[108] Shariq Chhapra, member, Intercultural Federation, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 60-61 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[109] Chhapra Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 61-62.

The second case involved the settlement of a racial dispute between a resident assistant and a student. In Chhapra's opinion, the DSAS:

> handled the matter unsatisfactorily. Due to their own interpretation of existing university bylaws regarding "fighting words," the DSAS decided not to consider the racial issue any further and opted instead for a misdemeanor charge against the accused.[110]

UCONN PANEL OF ADMINISTRATORS

Office of the UCONN President

After welcoming the Advisory Committee, UCONN President Harry J. Hartley expressed pleasure in hosting the factfinding meeting, saying that UCONN had dealt with some of the issues under discussion and was "firmly committed to fostering a multicultural climate." He pointed out that UCONN, which employs 8,000 persons to serve 25,000 students, was even then in the process of "appointing a new associate provost who will have the primary responsibility for multicultural programs and for fostering a multicultural climate within the university. . . ."[111]

Among UCONN's activities at the time of the factfinding meeting, said Hartley, were the development of an Asian American cultural center for the flagship campus at Storrs, starting an Asian studies program, and searching for a director for the Asian American Cultural Center to which new staff had been committed.[112] Faculty positions had also been committed for a new Institute for Puerto Rican and Latino Studies, and a search was in progress for the first director of the institute. An Institute for African American Studies had already been created, and funding, six positions, and space had been committed; that institute's director, Donald Spivey, was present for the meeting, added Hartley.[113]

---

[110] Chhapra Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 62.

[111] Harry J. Hartley, UCONN president, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 6-7 (herafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[112] See also Wan's discussion on p. 32. Since the factfinding meeting, an undated, six-page brochure—announcing "The 1993 East of California Asian American Studies Conference" held Nov. 12-14, 1993, by the UCONN Asian American Studies Institute—listed Angela Rota as director of the Asian American Cultural Center.

[113] Hartley Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 7-8.

Despite "these and even many other activities and initiatives that we have undertaken, I, as president, am not satisfied that enough has been done." Hartley pointed out "that there are those on our campuses who do not believe that the kinds of issues dealt with by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights are of importance to them," and stressed that bigotry should be viewed as appalling not just by the victims of bigotry but by everyone. He reminded the Committee of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who, while in the Birmingham jail, wrote that "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Although he concluded his remarks, Hartley observed the proceedings for most of the rest of the factfinding meeting.[114]

Division of Student Affairs and Services

Dr. Angela Terry, the assistant vice president for the Division of Student Affairs and Services (DSAS), said that universities today faced challenges in race and ethnic relations that were complex and tied as much to specific conditions as they were to deep-seated historical legacies affecting campuses and society at large. At the same time, comparing UCONN of 1992 to the UCONN of 1982 would clearly indicate:

> that some fundamental progress has been achieved, noting especially the diversity within our undergraduate student body. In addition [UCONN] has come to accept the fact that diversity involves more than just "add and stir" . . . and has moved forward in its commitment to clearly articulate the goal of building an interactive racial and ethnic community. . . . There has also been an increase in the retention rate for minority students.[115]

As a partner working toward the goal of diversity, said Terry, DSAS "has endeavored to contribute to a campus culture of awareness as opposed to a campus culture of denial." She would not claim that complete success had been achieved or that prejudice was absent at UCONN. But citing a review of intolerance on college campuses entitled *Hate in the Ivory Tower*, she pointed out that "the idyllic college campus," where students may pursue their studies "unburdened by the social ills beyond the campus gates," did not exist. To the contrary, according to Terry:

> For the most part students enter the university unprepared to deal effectively with people of different ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds. For they

---

[114] Hartley Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 8.

[115] Angela Terry, assistant vice president for the Division of Student Affairs and Services, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 69-70 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

> bring to the university many of the values, perceptions, and attitudes that weigh down the larger society's problems. . . .[116]

Nevertheless, Terry's division has focused on the need to educate "students and staff in multicultural literacy" through the "division's management practices, long-range planning activities, program development and assessment processes, and, finally, staff appraisals." Her division and its units have adopted a multifaceted strategy in recruitment, retention, and student and staff development. Sample initiatives have included an outreach program to minority middle school students to familiarize them with UCONN during an overnight stay and a day of planned activities.[117]

Orientation efforts have been expanded to convey UCONN's commitment to diversity and multiculturalism through remaking the orientation film to reflect more diversity on campus and to emphasize UCONN's "expectations of behavior in entering a multicultural environment." An additional initiative has begun to require all new resident assistants to enroll in a semester-long course on diversity and to receive additional training prior to the start of each semester. Student affairs professionals have been assigned to a standing committee on "the quality of life on campus for special population students."[118]

The evaluation of staff has also been revised to include an appraisal of performance in the areas of diversity and pluralism. Another initiative produced Project SOAR, the Student Opportunity for Access and Retention program, to guarantee cooperative education placement for every group of underrepresented students during their junior year, and an opportunity to receive scholarships from IBM, Aetna, Caldor's, the *Hartford Courant*, and other businesses. Lastly, a minority career fair featuring Connecticut and New England corporate and business representatives has been offered with voluntary donations by UTC for its continuation.

DSAS projects in planning included a joint study with the office of affirmative action programs to determine if minorities were reluctant to report on-campus acts of intolerance, and in the 1992 fall semester "a college program focusing upon peer education" was to be offered. Terry closed by referring to *Making Face, Making Soul* in which Gloria Yamato wrote:

> Many believe that prejudice can be dealt with effectively in one hellifying

---

[116] Terry Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 70.

[117] Terry Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 71.

[118] Terry Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 71-72.

> workshop or a one-hour-long heated discussion. I've run into folks who really think that we can beat this devil, kick this habit, be healed of this disease in a snap. In a sincere blink of a well-intended eye. Presto, poof, prejudice disappears. "We've dealt with our prejudice, now we can go to the beach," some people seem to think.

"We in student affairs are not at the beach," Terry concluded.[119]

School of Engineering

T.C. Ting, an associate dean in the School of Engineering, said that, as the only UCONN Asian American executive at his level, he felt obliged to speak of certain difficulties faced by Asian Americans. One has been that society in general has not appreciated the complexity of the Asian American community which "is a very diverse group" of different cultural backgrounds, said Ting. The discriminatory pre-1965 immigration laws resulted in the arrival of "unskilled and not very well educated" Asians who were confined to "urban ghettos or in farm communities."

After the revised immigration laws of 1965 incorporated a system of preference for professionals, large numbers of highly trained Asians entered the country, worked hard, and succeeded, continued Ting. However, after the Vietnam War, refugees arrived who were "not that well-educated and had language problems . . . [leading to a] very difficult situation." One problem was that on the one hand, some Asian Americans became viewed as the "model minority." On the other hand, the earlier arrivals from Asia and the newer arrivals from Vietnam, Cambodia, and elsewhere have experienced difficulties in language and in understanding the social customs. Neither the older arrivals nor the newer arrivals have been effectively helped.[120]

Ting suggested that the "model minority concept" has resulted in Asian Americans "still not officially being accepted as a minority group." For example, without disagreeing with Terry on the value of Project SOAR, Ting stated that he did not know of any scholarships available to Asian American students as members of a minority group.[121] In any case, even the more educated and apparently successful Asian Americans have some language problems. Thus, many have pursued careers in science and technology, "not because they are born with it, but because the language [of science and technology] is a little more universal; therefore, we work hard and appear to be successful in that."[122]

---

[119] Terry Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 72-74.

[120] T.C. Ting, associate dean, UCONN School of Engineering, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 74-75 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[121] Ting Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 98.

"Look at Asian culture," continued Ting. Asians have been:

> good in philosophy, good as social leaders. They have a lot of good statesmen, and their literature is wonderful. As a matter of fact, . . . in the 19th century, when Asia was being invaded by many other cultures —particularly by European cultures—it was their science and technology that defeated Asians. So Asian Americans are not born with talents only in science and technology.[123]

In other areas, Asian Americans "have no opportunity or little opportunity to develop."

For example, those Asian Americans who have succeeded in academia have become professors, but when seeking higher leadership positions, they have encountered the "glass ceiling," Ting charged. Those who have pursued careers in the social sciences have found the level of success drop off dramatically. As for work force statistics at UCONN, Ting pointed out that 60 percent of the Asian American males were faculty, with 30 percent in the professional nonprofessorial category. Among Asian American women, 12.5 percent were professorial; 34 percent, professional nonprofessorial; and 44.7 percent, maintenance and services. "I am the only one in the executive managerial category, and there are no Asian American women at this level," said Ting.[124]

Comparing Asian Americans to all others, Ting noted that 41 percent of the males were faculty, with 4.5 percent in the executive managerial category. Women overall were 31 percent in the professional nonprofessorial category; 13.5 percent were faculty; and 2.2 percent in executive managerial. "There are two dichotomies—one, at the high level you have a glass ceiling. At the lower level, you have a very large number being clustered at that level."

In closing, Ting acknowledged that "UCONN has been conscious about this issue in recent years." He said that an association of Asian faculty and staff had been established, and an Asian studies program and cultural center were being developed. "Asian-related literature" has also begun to be collected in the UCONN library. But he stressed that "the pace is slow, too slow."[125]

---

[122] Ting Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 75-76.

[123] Ibid.

[124] Ting Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 76-78.

Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center

Dr. Isnoel M. Rios, the director of the Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center, observed that to look at UCONN one had to look at it "in terms of the national debate on what is a bilingual and multicultural climate." He said that around the country there have been:

> forces such as the National Association of Scholars who basically want to still have the Eurocentric, the more or less "melting pot" point of view. But when we talk about multicultural environments, we have people of color basically, people in terms of issues of gender, and issues affecting orientation. . . . A multicultural climate means all of these things together, besides the European point of view.[126]

That debate has ocurred at UCONN also. "So, when we talk about reforming the curriculum, when we talk about recruiting minorities, it's also what type of minorities," Rios explained.

Apropos of Dr. Rios' allusion to the National Association of Scholars (NAS), it might be further noted here that about 2 weeks before the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting the NAS placed an advertisement in the *New York Times* entitled "The Wrong Way to Reduce Campus Tensions: A Statement of the National Association of Scholars," describing various "recent policies and practices that, far from promoting tolerance and fairness, are undermining them." (See appendix C.) Although the term multiculturalism was not used or among the approaches criticized, the statement specifically objected to:

- a willingness to admit students widely disparate in their level or preparation in order to make the campus demographically representative;

- preferential hiring for faculty and staff positions determined by race, ethnicity, and gender;

- racially or ethnically exclusive financial aid and academic counseling programs, as well as special administrators, ombudsmen, and resource centers assigned to serve as the putative representatives of selected student groups;

---

[125] Ting Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 78-79.

[126] Isnoel M. Rios, director, Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1993, transcript, pp. 79-80 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

- punitive codes restricting "insensitive" speech;

- mandatory "sensitivity training" for incoming freshmen and sometimes for all students, faculty, and staff;

- requirements that students take tendentious courses dealing with groups regarded as victimized;

- a failure to enforce campus rules when violated by those promoting these policies or other "politically correct" causes.[127]

During the factfinding meeting, Rios told the Advisory Committee that Latinos have come "from maybe 20 different countries . . . black, white, Indian, or a mixture of all three" among them. Some have been in America "a long time before Jamestown, a hundred years and more. Others are recent arrivals, no different than the Asian American experience." For 23 years, Latinos at UCONN have been trying to establish an institute of Latino studies. With UCONN having begun to establish other institutes for minority studies, "it seems [Latinos] are always at the back of the bus." In terms of employment, approximately 85 percent of Latinos at UCONN have been classified maintenance level. There has been one Puerto Rican faculty member, 10 other Latinos "in general faculty," and 5 Puerto Rican faculty Statewide. "It's now [1992] that we are finally getting the other position that was promised back in 1976 under a mandate from the board of trustees," continued Rios.[128]

He expressed frustration that despite mobilizing so many Latino degree holders and sitting in committee meetings advocating for Latinos year after year:

> it is only when you call a press conference because of a racial incident, that you get attention . . . resources. And it's ironic that now, while everybody's talking about budget cutbacks, and we have had to eliminate positions, that the university is committing itself to an Asian American Cultural Center, to Asian American studies, and to an Institute of Puerto Rican/Latino Studies.

Rios suggested that others were asking, "Well, why are you firing those people and giving those resources to those minorities?" In response, he would say, "Well, we were asking for this 7 years ago. We were asking for this 20 years ago when the resources were there." Nevertheless, he also feared that, given the problems faced by the State legislature, "while we have been saying these things for so many years, they are almost saying now, well, the money's not there. Our resources are closed, and that's the way it is."[129]

---

[127] National Association of Scholars, "The Wrong Way to Reduce Campus Tensions: a Statement of the National Association of Scholars," *New York Times*, Apr. 19, 1992, p. E-21.

[128] Rios Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 80-83.

At the same time, having looked at many universities around the Nation, Rios believed that UCONN "has the resources to be one of the most prominent multicultural institutions" in the Nation. But "UCONN is a reflection of the real world out there. If anything, we should not be surprised that the incidents are as high as they are, given where students come from."[130]

Office of Affirmative Action Programs

Thomasina Clemons, the director of the Office of Affirmative Action Programs, was formerly on the staff of the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. Her UCONN Office of Affirmative Action Programs included among its responsibilities the implementation of UCONN's plan for pluralism pursuant to the State Department of Higher Education's policy described at the outset by Commissioner De Rocco. Clemons began by agreeing with Rios that UCONN has "the potential to be perhaps the best multicultural institution in the country." She also observed that though UCONN/Storrs is in "eastern Connecticut, which some people think is a great distance off, it is affected by the State and certainly affected by the Nation."[131]

In her prepared remarks Clemons noted that UCONN's flagship campus is:

> surrounded by towns that have pockets of both organized and individual racial hostility. . . . No gate or wall can bar bigoted outsiders from the campus, and no admissions or hiring criteria can bar bigots from the student body and staff. . . . [At the same time,] our affirmative action programs have succeeded well enough for the main campus to have white, African American, Latino, and Asian/Asian American students and staff. Now that we are multicultural, we experience more intergroup or interpersonal clashes than

---

[129] Rios Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 83.

[130] Rios Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 84.

[131] Thomasina Clemons, director, UCONN Office for Affirmative Action Programs, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 85 and 99 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

> we did when we were more biracial.[132]

Living at the eastern edge of Hartford County, for 12 years she has driven secondary roads daily between there and the UCONN Storrs campus. Her experience has been that:

> From time to time, passing drivers hurl racial epithets at me, and, more dangerously, an occasional motorist will attempt to edge me off the road. Such behavior has increased within the past 2 years.[133]

Clemons added that the institution was affected by the local and national economy and changes therein. The combination of demographic changes leading to increased diversity, the changes in expectations, and the changes in the level of economic resources could pose a threat, if there were no careful plan as to how to proceed. At UCONN, including Storrs:

> and the other campuses that relate directly to Storrs, to our benefit we have more people, more organizations, more networks that are advocating positive change, standing up for rights, and generally making a more constructive dialogue . . . than I have ever seen in the past 15 years.[134]

She also noted that there were more resources directed at multicultural interests with more coming plus more formal professional counseling. Looking at situations from a "fix-it orientation," she added that "one thing that is going very well" was the fact that:

> For the first time perhaps in the history of this institution—and maybe in any higher institution in Connecticut—people in positions of authority such as at the vice president's level, associate vice president's level, the whole administration, are actually being evaluated [in terms of] their . . . cooperation with affirmative action and a multicultural agenda. We have had the rhetoric for years. We have not had the practice until recently, and I think that is a major breakthrough.[135]

She then pointed to the then-upcoming June 1992 President's Conference for Managers on Civil Rights and Social Equity, the first such conference in 10 years.

---

[132] Thomasina Clemons, "Statement to the Connecticut Advisory Committee, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, April 27, 1992, Farmington, Connecticut," p. 1.

[133] Ibid.

[134] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 85-86.

[135] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 87.

With regard to problems, Clemons indicated that the first on her list was the narrow-minded, provincial attitude leading some to think of UCONN as "defined by the immediate acreage" instead of "factoring in the outside world into our resolutions." The second problem was the lack of success in bringing minority employees and students into the mainstream; instead, "we have pockets of what I would call semisegregated populations." Moreover, like many institutions, UCONN has tended to be crisis-oriented, responding to press conferences and incidents more rapidly than to the ongoing need to plan. The last problem was that there has been "more likelihood of competition for scarce resources than there had been."[136]

Clemons observed that:

> there are always going to be peaks and valleys in the rate at which you approach issues. Whether you see them as problems or not, you cannot give your maximum attention to every single event or program at all times.
>
> Therefore, we have to plan. We have to make our systems carry us through some of the valleys. That means we cannot leave any of our human resources unattended, whether they are multicultural resources or more traditional human resources. That means there has to be some mechanism in the system that is dealing with the human problems, the interpersonal disputes, whether they are racially based or otherwise. There has to be someone in the system involved with training.[137]

She hoped that the issues presented to the Advisory Committee would lead to an adoption of such issues as "core issues, core thrust, and not fashionable or reactionary kinds of things that we do to satisfy special interest groups or to respond to invidividual incidents." Attention to the issues had:

> to become as vital as paying people to work, dispensing grades. Whatever the apparatus to run an institution, all of this has to be fed into the system so that it becomes an ongoing part of our environment.[138]

Health Center Affirmative Action Office

Dr. Archie Savage, the director for affirmative action at the UCONN Health Center, observed that "we have traditionally thought of diversity in the context of legal or moral imperatives," but diversity can also be viewed from other perspectives, "each with a different agenda." For example:

---

[136] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 86-87.

[137] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 88.

[138] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 88-89.

> Civil rights seeks to end discrimination and racism and to comply with legal requirements; it asks, "What do civil rights-related laws guarantee our employees and our students?" Women's rights focuses on eliminating sexism and asks, "What can be done to eliminate discrimination against women?" Humanitarianism, based on a view of the human race as a brotherhood, seeks to foster good relations through enhanced tolerance, acceptance, and understanding of individual differences. It asks, "What can be done to enhance relations among all peoples for the good of the human species?"[139]

Also mentioning moral responsibility and social responsibility among the range of perspectives, Savage stated that "all of these perspectives are legitimate. None is superior to another." They have inspired most of the programs clustered under the umbrella concepts of affirmative action and cultural awareness used to deal with issues that arise when a work force or student body is diverse.

Savage then explained that a new perspective was called for, that of management, where priority would be placed on the interest of institutions or corporations. In that context:

> The questions are: What do I, as a manager, need to do to ensure the effective and efficient utilization of employees in pursuit of the institutional mission? And what are the implications of diversity for how I manage? The new approach is a move away from the historical assumption that the solution to diversity is assimilation.[140]

According to Savage, affirmative action has been the chief, often the exclusive strategy for assimilating minorities and women into the institution or corporate entity. He cautioned that in assimilating "we should not try to make everybody the same. . . . We are truly not trying to be a melting pot. A salad [of various ingredients] would be more descriptive of what we are, of what our institutions should be." To that end, institutions have sometimes been spurred to implement affirmative action programs by legal requirements, moral beliefs, a sense of social responsibility, or by all three. Savage noted that those programs grew out of a series of assumptions:

---

[139] Archie Savage, director, Affirmative Action Office, UCONN Health Center, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 89-90 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[140] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 90-91.

> First, the mainstream of U.S. institutions is made up of white males. Second, women and minorities are excluded from this mainstream because of widespread racial, ethnic, and sexual prejudices. Third, such exclusion is unnecessary, given the strength of the U.S. economic edifice and the educational system. Fourth, [exclusion] is contrary to both good public policy and common decency. Finally, legal and social coercion are necessary to bring about change.[141]

Affirmative action programs have taken one of three tracks, continued Savage. The passive approach takes steps necessary to ensure compliance with the law by eliminating blatant expressions of discrimination and educating employees on acceptable behavior. The pipeline approach is when passive managers also implement creative programs to enhance assimilation. Savage called the third approach the hierarchy or upper mobility approach. It is used by an institution that has attracted those qualified minorities and women most likely to mesh with the institution's culture but which continues its intervention because:

> too often hiring the right women or minorities does not necessarily solve the original problem. The newly hired employees do not progress as expected. White males complain about preferential treatment and reverse discrimination. Minorities and women are uncomfortably aware of the stigma of affirmative action activities. Everybody is unhappy.
>
> Employees feel stuck and frustrated. Managers still have their resolute problem; in addition, they are not given credit for their good faith effort, and, discouraged, they quit trying. At this point, the realization sets in. Affirmative action is placed on the back burner. This stage continues until the next crisis prompts action. And the cycle is repeated. The three approaches lead to glass ceilings for women and premature plateauing for minorities. The cycle begins with recognition of a problem, then the crisis, excessive turnover, inadequate upper mobility, and disproportionately low morale.[142]

Savage pointed out that central to the problem has been that affirmative action was never intended to be a permanent tool. Instead, it was to fulfill a legal, moral, and social responsibility—a government prescription that was artificial, transitional, and temporary. It gave relief from the negative consequences of past practices "and time to correct actions, but not to take corrective action." As to corrective action, Savage said the question is, what corrective action? For:

> acceptance, tolerance, and understanding of diversity are good, but not

---

[141] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 91.

[142] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 91-93.

> enough to create an improved and empowered work force. To improve and empower a diverse work force to reach its full potential, managing diversity is needed.
>
> Managing diversity asks, given the competitive environment and the diverse work force we have, are we getting the highest productivity possible? Does our system work as smoothly as it could? Is morale as high as we would wish? And are those things as strong as they would be if all the people who worked here were the same sex, the same race, the same nationality, and have the same lifestyle and value system and the same way of working? If any answers are "No," then the solution is to substitute positive for negative aspects. That means changing the system and modifying the core culture.[143]

In summary, Savage emphasized that managing diversity was a new approach, though not entirely unrelated to or incompatible with other diversity approaches. But:

> managers who wish to have maximum options when dealing with employee diversity will want to use all three approaches: affirmative action, valuing diversity, and managing diversity. Effectively doing so, however, requires a clear understanding of the action implications of each approach.[144]

Four months after the factfinding meeting, *Nation's Business*, the monthly published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ran a six-page cover story, "Winning With Diversity." The cover story reminded readers that "the labor pool is changing—the ranks of women, minorities, and immigrants are increasing, and those of white males are declining"—as has the pool of customers. It offered eight action steps specifically aimed at helping employers in the private sector manage diversity.[145] The steps included anticipating backlash and changing the culture of the company to accommodate the employees working for it, somewhat along the lines suggested by Savage.

Savage, Terry, Ting, Rios, Clemons on Multiculturalism Debate

On behalf of the Advisory Committee, moderator Sanabria, asked the panel how one might balance the pursuit of multiculturalism with continuing the heritage and tradition of the dominant culture? Having previously argued for a new approach that would move away from the historical assumption that the solution to diversity was assimilation, Savage replied that "We should not try to make everybody the same." Instead, the core and roots of the institution should be reexamined to see whether and how diversity has been accepted. "We are truly not trying to be a 'melting pot.' A salad would be more descriptive of what we are, of what our institutions should be."[146]

---

[143] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 93-94.

[144] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 94.

[145] Sharon Nelson, "Winning With Diversity," *Nation's Business*, September 1992, pp. 18-24.

Terry added that:

> to build upon what Dr. Savage has said, the whole notion in terms of diversity is moving from diversity to pluralism. Pluralism carries within it the notion that each individual group is able to acknowledge its culture as well as to become knowledgeable of the culture of the mainstream . . . and also that the majority in the mainstream culture will also acknowledge the minority group's culture. So, where there is an acceptance of diversity . . . , we do not think in terms of assimilation, because there you have groups lose their cultural heritage.[147]

Ting noted that the factfinding meeting was being held during the local observance of Asian history month; at UCONN he had given the speech marking the start of the month, mentioning that "the melting pot is an erroneous concept." He preferred the concept of a pot of stew—"the stew within, the meat and the vegetables, each has its own distinct characteristics and unique contribution."[148]

Rios commented that whether they "call it a 'melting pot,' or a 'salad bowl,' or a 'stew,' . . . I think there are elements of both." He suggested that at times "either you have to be this way or not that way. The national debate [about multiculturalism] is part of saying 'it's okay to be this, but it's okay to be that, [too].' There is another larger issue here of tolerance, and I think that is one of the things we have to foster."[149]

Clemons observed that:

> . . . some people who are apprehensive about multiculturalism or pluralism assume that the separate groups will all be acting in the same place without interacting and that there will be no common thread. My assumption is that in a community of any size—either a campus or a nation, there will be a

---

[146] Savage Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 94-96.

[147] Terry Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 96.

[148] Ting Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 96.

[149] Rios Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 97.

> common thread that holds us together—but it will not restrict us to the point that we cannot be individuals or that our group identity cannot be manifested.[150]

UCONN FACULTY PANEL

African American Studies Institute

Dr. Donald Spivey, the director of the African American Studies Institute and a professor of history, said that having lived and taught on both the east and west coasts and in the midwest, he found:

> nothing new about the issues we are addressing today. This for me is personally very sad. This could be the commission hearings in 1949 or 1963. We talk about multiculturalism and Afrocentrism today, but more than 40 years ago we were talking about the same things, although the terminology was different.[151]

At any rate, there have been many "deplorable and despicable [incidents at UCONN] and at colleges and universities throughout the Nation." Deciding against just relating examples of such incidents, Spivey chose instead to examine why they occur. The answer was the same as:

> to the question of why the sales clerk is not helpful, why the kid working at the local McDonald's doesn't say "thank you," why the student at your office door comes in without knocking, why some employers think that blacks, Latinos, and other people of color won't work hard, or why some men think that there are some professions and occupations that women can't excel at, or why some hold stereotypical views of Asians or blame the Japanese for America's economic woes. . . .
>
> It is the same answer that is found . . . in the various commission reports of the 1960s: the Walker Commission Report, the Skolnick Commission Report, the Graham and Gurr Commission Report, and the Kerner Com-

---

[150] Clemons Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 97-98.

[151] Donald Spivey, director, UCONN African American Studies Institute, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 101 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

> mission Report.[152] What is the one underlying cause that runs through all of these reports, books, and studies . . . ? I am not a reductionist but the one common factor is ignorance, the basic lack of understanding of one another, and hence, a basic lack of respect for one another as human beings.[153]

Spivey said the problem on college campuses was symptomatic of the problem in the larger society. "We are a society which, with the passage of each day, is becoming fundamentally less educated. As one noted scholar said many years ago, 'Civilization is only one generation deep.'" With proper nuturing lacking in the home and quality education lacking in primary and secondary schools, it has not been surprising that:

> we as a society reap the bitter fruit produced by a lack of proper cultivation. . . . Ask yourself how bad is the situation if these manifestations are occurring on college campuses, the citadels of learning and knowledge, the ivory tower of tolerance?

To remedy the problem, Spivey recommended that ignorance be identified as the foremost enemy and that a war on ignorance be declared similar to the 1960s war against poverty. The Nation's universities and colleges must then take the lead in inculcating the population at every level with an appreciation of, and respect for, diversity. "We are, after all, at the top of the educational food chain, and, as such, the responsibility to spearhead this war on ignorance falls upon us."[154]

At the same time, a micro plan and a macro plan of action must be developed, said Spivey. At UCONN, the Institute for African American Studies has initiated a "micro effort" educating the campus community about the African American experience, recruiting more minority faculty and minority graduate students, hosting a critical issues lecture series, developing an undergraduate major in African American studies, bringing inner-city youths to visit UCONN/Storrs, and offering public seminars and teacher workshops in Hartford and elsewhere.

---

[152] Daniel Walker, *Rights in Conflict: the Violent Confrontation of Demonstrators and Police in the Parks and Streets of Chicago During the Week of the Democratic National Convention of 1968* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968); Jerome Skolnick, *The Politics of Protest: Violent Aspects of Protest & Confrontation* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969); Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, *Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969); and Otto Kerner and John V. Lindsay, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968). The first three studies were reports made to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, though they were not reports by that Commission.

[153] Spivey Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 102-03.

[154] Spivey Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 103-04.

Meanwhile, according to Spivey, at the macro level, the university's leadership must inventory its resources and "effectively integrate each division, unit, department, and individual . . . into a master plan, a strategic and coordinated campaign against the enemy which is ignorance." Moreover, at the national level, the "supreme commander-in-chief must do the same."[155]

Department of Sociology

Ronald L. Taylor, professor in the department of sociology, noted that he was "always struck" by the misunderstanding of the nature of the problem.

> People talk about prejudice and discrimination as though these were really at the core of the problem. Yet we know that the polls show that attitudes of prejudice have plummeted over the last 20 years. We are not talking just about prejudice. We are talking about racism. We are talking about a phenomenon that is also built into a structure.[156]

Taylor indicated that since racism was structurally built into the institution, working to change the attitudes and behavior of students will "not make a lot of difference" if the institutional structures do not change. The magnitude of the problem has also been underestimated; for example, the resistance of many colleagues to Taylor's course on multiculturalism seemed an indicator of the magnitude, according to Taylor.

> They say they're all for pluralism. They're for diversity. But "we don't want a course on [multiculturalism.] It's too complicated. It balkanizes the campus. It creates separation among people." . . . And I say, "well, if in fact that's not the way to go, then what would you propose?" [They reply,] "Well, we don't have a solution to that, except that we think by bringing all of these people together, something will happen. Something magical will happen."[157]

As a sociologist, Taylor believed that such, in fact, would not happen. Most UCONN students came from "highly segregated environments," which was especially true of African American and Hispanic students, said Taylor.

---

[155] Spivey Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 104-05.

[156] Ronald L. Taylor, professor, UCONN Department of Sociology, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 106 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[157] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 106-07.

> I've had students tell me that the first time they were called names, "Nigger," for example, was at the University of Connecticut because in their [home] communities, of course, they did not have whites. They did not go to school with white students. They did not have many encounters with whites.[158]

Thus, Taylor argued that it was not enough to bring different students together and "hope something will happen." As a participant in UCONN's Center for Academic Programs, which was designed to serve 100 to 125 minority students a year, Taylor has attempted to explain:

> what race is and is not, what racism is and is not, so that . . . when it happened to them, there would be no mistake as to whether we were talking about simply an expression of prejudice that was very common, and what was much more serious, and in some cases life-threatening. And that is old-fashioned racism.[159]

During the summers, Taylor has given a series of four lectures detailing the nature of racism so as to prepare incoming minority students to enter "an environment that is often hostile." Taylor also has taught a larger course, "Prejudice and Discrimination," initially once a week on Thursday nights, from 6 to 9. Though Thursday night was "the worst night in the week because that's a party night at UCONN," Taylor was surprised; expecting only 50 to 60 students, he found 160 students for a course that has not been mandatory. He concluded that there has been a perceived need on the part of students who "wanted to know more about something that had become an issue. That was most encouraging."[160]

Taylor pointed out that students have increasingly become able to recognize "institutional racism, but many of our faculty and administrators unfortunately don't understand and recognize what it is." For this reason, he believed that the magnitude of the problem has been underestimated and "we tend to pretend that somehow by doing little things, that these things will make things better."

He saw part of the solution as calling for staff, faculty, and students to devise a coordinated program. DSAS has described the "important and nice things" it was doing, and faculty members and students have done likewise. But "the problem is, we don't work together," said Taylor. "We can design all the programs we want separately. And I think

---

[158] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 107. See also "Hartford Schools Molded by Racial Isolation."

[159] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 107-08.

[160] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 134-35.

10 years from now, we'll be sitting right here talking about the same thing. We were, you know, 10 years ago." Until a concerted campaign has attacked the institutional core of the problem, complaints from students will continue, Taylor said, adding that:

> Being on a college campus like the University of Connecticut makes you feel vulnerable. See, I'm not white; I'm me. And I know that all kinds of things are going on behind closed doors that affect my future. None of this may be so, of course, but I need to be convinced otherwise. I need to be reassured from time to time that you have my interest at heart. And so a quick response when something happens is absolutely essential to me.
>
> Otherwise I get a different kind of message. You don't take this seriously enough. . . . And so we let it slide, an absolutely dismal response guaranteed to undermine whatever else you do because I don't care what you say. What I care more about is how you act.[161]

In that regard, Taylor complimented Hartley, whom he had known for 28 years. The various commitments for minority studies and institutes have been made in economically depressed times. "That's more meaningful to me than doing it in good times." However, Taylor closed by emphasizing that:

> we need to address the whole issue again of how we get around the opposition, the growing opposition to multiculturalism, that comes mainly, surprisingly, from the faculty. . . . We have failed to address that issue. . . . Until we address the issue among the faculty, we are going to continue to have this problem. We need to have a group of people that are enthusiastic about this and understand why it is important to be supportive of this kind of approach. Otherwise . . . we will continue to see pretty much what we've seen in recent years on college campuses—an increase in the level of tension between racial and religious groups.[162]

School of Engineering

Dr. Peter Luh, a professor in the School of Engineering and the president of the Asian Faculty and Staff Association, stated that at UCONN the "Asian American issue actually was awakened by the December 3 incident in 1987." The subsequent call for redress was led by several students and Paul Bock, then a UCONN professor. For background Luh explained that Asian American undergraduate and graduate students made up about 800 students, the largest minority group on campus, and of the approximately 1,000 international students, 66 percent were from Asian countries. Meanwhile, "Of the faculty and staff, we are second to the largest, after blacks. But for faculty members, we are the largest."[163]

---

[161] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 108-11.

[162] Taylor Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 112.

Despite the concentration of Asian American and Asian students:

> there is very little cultural support, social support, or psychological or any recognition or support. . . . Until recently there's no Asian American studies program, no cultural center, and [Asian Americans are] not part of the minority advancement program, as Dean Ting alluded to earlier. Since the December 3 incident, there are many other incidents. . . . And since then, faculty, staff, and students are demoralized.[164]

Luh indicated that they have not been allowed to participate in the minority advancement program or the engineering minority program, based on the statewide policy of not including Asian Americans in that program and not simply based on some policy peculiar to the school of engineering. In that connection, he urged that Asian Americans "be officially classified as a minority" by the State of Connecticut and UCONN, and he pointed out that "the word 'underrepresented' minority is very misleading." Although referred to as "Asian Americans," they actually came from different backgrounds, were in "really urgent need of help, and there is no place [for them] to turn."[165]

A May 1993 front-page article of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* reflected the thrust of Luh's complaint on a more national scale as well as in reference to the greater Philadelphia area. It disclosed that "In the last 5 years, the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education has begun investigations at 10 schools suspected of admissions discrimination against Asian Americans." The article pointed out further that a "prestigious" school in the northeast responded to Asian American student charges somewhat similar to Luh's by:

> adding an Asian American student intern in the admissions office and hiring a new coordinator of minority recruitment. The school also is reviewing a practice that guarantees financial aid to other minority students who demonstrate need, but not to Asian Americans. Finally, it has said it will review its recruitment program to determine how to reach a more diverse Asian

---

[163] Peter Luh, professor, UCONN School of Engineering, and president, Asian Faculty and Staff Association, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 112-13 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript). For additional details, see app. D, Luh's subsequently revised statement.

[164] Luh Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 113.

[165] Luh Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 114.

American community.[166]

At the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting, Luh also reported that many applications for faculty positions had been submitted by Asian Americans, but "the number of those interviewed versus the number of applicants, or the number of hires out of the number of applicants, for Asians, it's considerably less than for white and other minority groups." He said that another example affecting faculty hiring was a recruitment advertisement about 2 years ago stating, "Preference will be given to U.S. citizens and permanent residents who received all three degrees in the United States. . . B.S., Master's, and Ph.D."

A different kind of problem related to Asian American History Month being celebrated at UCONN for the first time in the month that the factfinding meeting was being held. A number of student organizations had obtained a total of about $900 from the Student Union Board of Government and the Office of the President, according to Luh. But when they asked for funds "to show the [1989 Academy Award nominee] film *Who Killed Vincent Chin?* they could not secure the money to rent it. It cost about $125."[167]

Luh claimed that the UCONN Asian language program was like an orphan among all language programs, with 33 courses in French, 51 in German, 11 in Hebrew, 23 in Italian, 19 in Portugese, 27 in Russian, 39 in Spanish, and the like. However, the various Asian languages were grouped under the title, "Critical Languages Program," and there were only 7 courses listed in that program which also included Finnish, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Polish, and others. Moreover, recalling that Hartley had said that an interim director was being sought for the Asian American studies program, Luh pointed out that a candidate for the position had once failed to be hired because the candidate would not accept the conditions, for "there's no faculty position committed to the program. The salary is not satisfactory, and there are many [other] issues."

On the other hand, Luh mentioned that the Asian Faculty-Staff Association has been organized, as well as the Asian American Students Association and the United Asian Student Council. Campus Asian Americans have also been working with the African American, Latino, Asian American, and Native American Coalition. "It's a very encouraging sign.

---

[166] Ralph Vigoda, "On Campus, a Stereotype That Carries a Double Edge; Young Asian Americans Say the Perception of Success Penalizes Them," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 9, 1993, p. A-1 (hereafter cited as "On Campus, a Stereotype That Carries a Double Edge . . . .").

[167] Luh Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 114-15.

. . . With various groups working with the leadership of the administration, we have made some progress and have to credit President Hartley and Provost Tom Tighe for their very supportive roles."[168]

School of Social Work

Dr. Julio Morales of the UCONN School of Social Work explained that he was president of Latinos Contra SIDA—the Latino organization addressing AIDS in Hartford—which was also in session on the day of the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting. Attending that gathering made him late for the factfinding meeting, a type of problem often faced by minority faculty who were spread thinly over many organizations.

The problem was acute, "perhaps even more so with Puerto Rican faculty . . . [who] are expected to do an awful lot within our communities and within academia." The difficulty was compounded by the fact that there were only four Puerto Ricans among the 1,100 faculty members, and three of the four were at the social work school on the West Hartford campus. Morales added that he:

> once figured out that we should have 9 to 10 times as many Puerto Ricans to begin to approach parity, based on the population of Puerto Ricans in this State which is more than 5 percent. That's not talking about the other Latinos.[169]

He then shared an example of a hiring problem that had occurred about 2 years earlier:

> when there was a faculty position in the history department that was clearly marked as a position for Puerto Rican studies to teach Puerto Rican history, migration, etc. There was an awful lot of debate on the campus about whether that person should be an academic or a community activist. . . . It was a kind of ridiculous debate because actually both are needed, and the real issue is that many more Puerto Rican faculty are needed.[170]

---

[168] Luh Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 116-17.

[169] Julio Morales, faculty member, UCONN School of Social Work, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 118-19 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[170] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 119.

As mentioned earlier, many documents were submitted by student panelist Martinez, including a February 26, 1991, letter from Morales to UCONN President Hartley with a 21-page attachment. Morales' letter responded to Hartley's request for suggestions on how to increase the number of Puerto Rican faculty at UCONN. The attachment described Morales' "Growing Our Own" proposal whereby adjunct instructors who have lacked the credentials of a doctorate but who had already proven themselves in UCONN classrooms or in field work might be hired to serve on the faculty while simultaneously earning UCONN doctorates.[171]

At any rate, Morales emphasized that it was imperative for many groups, both public and private, on the campus and elsewhere to combat racism and religious bias. However, he also believed "that to do so without looking at sexism and ableism, ageism, and homophobia or heterosexism fosters the belief that there is a hierarchy among suppressed groups." That situation could lead to "greater competition among these groups," and Morales noted that "it is important to get to the issue that some of the oppressed groups oppress each other. . . ."

He also remarked that "problems related to a lack of tolerance on the campuses are really a function of the larger societal order." Campuses were part of a society that usually resorted to "violence as a way of addressing issues, and it is important to consider what that means when we come to academia." Most people in academia endorsed the concepts of inclusion and a nonracist campus, at least intellectually. At the same time, he observed that because a person "may be Puerto Rican, black, or another ethnic or racial minority, it does not mean that we know our history, our culture, or our contributions to society."[172]

Moreover, making the campus nonracist was difficult to achieve since the larger society was not nonracist, said Morales, pointing out that:

> When you look at [Hartford] it seems to be rather well-integrated in terms of the three major groups currently in the State. It is approximately one-third African American, one-third Latino, and one-third white. However, . . . one-third of the population, the white population, lives in the south end. One-third of the population, the black population, lives in the north end. And one-third of the population, the Latino population, lives in the middle. . . . Also Hartford and other cities seem to experience more violence, more drugs, more extreme poverty, and more of the extreme wealth than the larger

---

[171] Julio Morales, Ph.D., professor, letter to UCONN President Harry Hartley, Feb. 26, 1991, and attachment.

[172] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 136.

society.[173]

In January 1993 the *New York Times* reported that a study of a 25-year-old desegregation plan for Hartford and its suburbs had been cited in school desegregation cases across the Nation. The plan, called Project Concern, has recently involved only 680 of Hartford's 25,700 public school children. It invited children from schools in the predominantly black North End of Hartford to attend schools in other towns. According to the study, Project Concern "graduates were much more positive about participating in an integrated world, and were much more optimistic about their prospects for promotion at work." On the other hand:

> The students who attended Hartford's segregated schools . . . lacked a network of friends in the larger, white work world to point them toward job openings, had a harder time, in their language and dress, presenting themselves to employers, weren't relaxed with white supervisors, and were angrier and less able to deal with the demands of integrated settings.[174]

To overcome some problems associated with the effects of such segregation, during the factfinding meeting, Morales urged working on UCONN's curricula so as to create:

> opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to reflect on America's history of genocide and slavery, racism and colonialism, extreme poverty, but also extreme wealth and privilege, and the impact that such legacies have on today's society. . . . Social courses must help us to think about how we can change as individuals, as groups in society, raising consciousness and sensitivity. . . .[175]

He also thought it important to look at how often courses were offered, pointing out that at the undergraduate level there were two courses on Puerto Rican issues, "but they have not been taught for many years." Speaking more generally, he observed that courses on minority issues were not offered in "prime time." Often, if few students took the courses, they were dropped. Morales, however, believed that these courses were important enough to be continued and that, if taught well, they would attract students.

Morales reported that in the past the Storrs curriculum unit had been seeking suggestions for a required course on gender, race, ethnicity, and multiculturalism. Through the president's affirmative action advisory committee he offered an outline of a course required of all social work students. That course is called "Human Oppression: The African American and Puerto Rican Experience." Morales observed that "social work students often go into the course with a great deal of resistance. However, by the end of the semester they come to think it has been a very valuable experience."

---

[173] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 122.

[174] George Judson, "Effects of Segregation Told in a Trial: Famed School Study of Hartford and Suburbs Given as Evidence," *New York Times*, Jan. 6, 1993, p. B-5. See also "Hartford Schools Molded by Racial Isolation."

[175] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 121-22.

Believing that the type of content in the course needed to be diffused throughout the entire UCONN curriculum, Morales noted that "Usually it provides as much new information for minority students as it does for people who are not of color." Moreover, when students evaluated the social work curriculum, the human oppression course was one of the courses remembered the most and one that had helped them most after they graduated.[176]

In closing, Morales said that "without a doubt, the University of Connecticut has done much to address the issue of diversity and multiculturalism, and respect and tolerance." He acknowledged that UCONN's policies on intolerance were "excellent guiding policies" and that there has been "an honest attempt to consciously and consistently address issues of intolerance." He cited the president's affirmative action advisory committee, the provost's commission on multiculturalism, and the work of the office of affirmative action programs, as examples of UCONN's efforts.

At the same time, he felt that "these types of programs and ideas must be strengthened in order for us to continue to forge ahead" and that it was important "for all of us to struggle with the issue of cuts and priorities, and to continue to work on creating even a better system." Like Rios, he believed that UCONN has "a great deal of potential for being a model in this area."[177]

Community Medicine/Health Care

Dr. Gary King, a faculty member of the UCONN Health Center, stated that he experienced a feeling of deja vu. Unlike many of his fellow panelists, he was "a product of [UCONN's] undergraduate curriculum, and shared many of the sentiments that the students have raised." King expressed pride in the fact that Taylor had been his major advisor. He also recalled that from 1970 through 1974 there were three significant protests. In particular, April 1974 "was regarded as the university's April of discontent and rebellion when 214 black and Hispanic students took over what was then the Wilbur Cross Library."[178]

---

[176] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 124.

[177] Morales Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 121-24.

Some of the 14 demands on that occasion were for an Afro-American Cultural Center with more resources than previously available at the center of that era, more black students, increased financial aid, and more black faculty members. In terms of culture, more speakers who could address the black and Latino experience were demanded together with black- and Latino-oriented social entertainment. Students also:

> wanted set policies for the administration to establish with regard to students and others who violated a person's humanity by calling [the person] derogatory racial names or participating in that type of activity.[179]

Many of the demands have since been fulfilled, acknowledged King, referring to the achievements mentioned by De Rocco and earlier panelists, "but there's much more to be done." The concepts of multiculturalism and diversity have become very important to minority students, but multiculturalism and diversity have also become related to "structure, history, and life chances," continued King.

He noted that multiculturalism and diversity have often been thought of merely in terms of different foods, music, clothes, and dialects. However, the concepts also had to be viewed in terms of their relationship to the social structure, economic opportunity, justice, and equality. When students have spoken of multiculturalism and diversity, "they are not simply talking about accepting the way they look or the way they dress. They are also talking about making this a better society in terms of equality and in terms of justice."[180]

King said that the UCONN Health Center, with its hospital and medical and dental schools, "is a well regarded institution. It is a productive environment. Our people are very serious about what they do." However, King pointed out that "they are not quite as serious about the issues that we are discussing today." While not implying that there was no institutional policy on the matter, he did believe that "there perhaps is a little less progress in this area than there should be," particularly with respect to the employment of minority faculty.

---

[178] Gary King, faculty member, UCONN Health Center, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 125-26 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[179] King Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 126.

[180] King Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 127-28.

Hiring minority faculty was not only a matter of "justice and equality in this society," said King, it was also key to the type of research conducted, the way medicine was practiced, the health problems and issues focused upon, and the target populations served. He suggested that there was "a strong correlation" between the types of faculty persons available and the academic interests pursued; for example, the availability of minority faculty could lead to research on the disparity in health outcomes between blacks and whites.

King urged more outreach to urban minority communities. Some attempts were being made through the community medicine department, but more was needed on the part of the center as a whole. At the same time, King credited the center with having "made a good deal of progress" in recruiting and maintaining minority students in the medical and the dental schools. With regard to staff and faculty, King noted that over the previous 2 or 3 years there had been an increase in the number of center employees but a net decrease in the number of minority employees, especially blacks and Latinos.[181]

---

[181] King Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 129-31.

IV. WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

> The changes we are trying to make now are different from what our predecessors [sought.] . . . My main concern now is not that going around campus someone will call me a "spic" or something like that. My concern is getting Latino faculty, Latino courses. So it's kind of a different battle, and it's kind of more long range than short.
>
> *Lucinda Mendez*, Student
> Wesleyan University

> No specific administrative office is charged with addressing the needs of minority students. All university resources and agencies are charged with the responsibility of responding to the needs of students of color as they relate to the expertise of that particular resource. . . . All offices have responsibilities for all groups. There is an institutional recognition that special needs may exist for special groups, for certain groups or subgroups, and that every professional in the institution must respond to them.
>
> *Janina Montero*, Dean of
> the College
> Wesleyan University

For mention of selected aspects of Wesleyan University in terms of antidiscrimination and diversity, see pages 3 and 4.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT PANEL

Ajua-Campos and Student of Color Council

Lucinda Mendez, a senior and cochairperson of Ajua-Campos, said that the organization was for Latinos at Wesleyan University. It was 22 years old and served as a "cultural, social, political, and academic base for Latino students," providing representation to the administration, faculty, and others. Members have counseled Latinos on which classes to choose and promoted awareness about the diverse communities among the Latinos on campus. The organization included La Casa Albizu Campos, which housed eight students and was where the organization met. Intended as a resource for the Latino community, the house contained a library under development by the members.[182]

Mendez also described the Student of Color Council (SCC). Formerly known as the TriMinority Council, SCC was established in the 1987-88 school year by African American, Latino, and Asian American students working together. According to Mendez, the name was changed because "we don't really like to use the term minority at Wesleyan" and, though the number of Native Americans was still small, it was anticipated that more Native Americans would enroll and these students of color needed to be included, too. At any rate, "people looked to the SCC for the voice of students of color."[183]

Mendez acknowledged that the administration and the faculty have worked with students on the issues of racism and race relations. She stated that there was:

> a core group in the administration, the faculty, and the student body that is constantly working together and trying to change things. But then the majority only react when something happens, when an incident occurs on campus or something like that.

She further explained that Wesleyan University "does not believe in requirements," rendering it unheard of to attempt to make workshops or courses on race relations mandatory. She found it:

> hard to function in a structure like that where no one person at the top—not even the [Wesleyan University] president—says what goes. It's really hard to work in a structure that's more horizontal than vertical.[184]

Moreover, the faculty was "very independent" and the students too, making it difficult to "tell people what to do." According to Mendez, the institution had no requirements; it had expectations. Consequently, instead of saying, "'We are going to have these requirements,'" one said, "'Well, maybe we can have some of these expectations in here.'" Then a majority of the student body would respond, "'Yes, we should; people should have to take courses on race relations," without adding that the courses must be required. Mendez acknowledged, however, that, even if such courses were required, it would not make any difference to someone who does not wish to learn. "So we reach the people who are willing to change and have an open mind."[185]

---

[182] Lucinda Mendez, cochairperson, Ajua-Campos, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 139 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[183] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 140.

[184] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 141. See, however, pp. 76-77 for the discussion by Dr. Janina Montero, then dean of the college, Wesleyan University, regarding the campus' institutional approach to accommodating students of color.

Mendez believed that there was resistance to curriculum reform, not mainly from the faculty but from "traditional people who have been there for a very long time, maybe the tenured faculty. . . ." She thought that it was threatening to some to be told:

> "You who are an expert in such and such an area, you don't know about the African American side of this or the Latino side. . . ." I think it shakes them up, and that is why there is resistance to incorporating those classes.[186]

She reported that at the time of the factfinding meeting the students "were really struggling to start Latino studies courses and Asian American studies courses." An African American studies program had already been established, although Mendez thought that it "could also use some help." In summary she said that:

> I guess we are trying to make institutional changes which are long term and, when you are here for 4 years, you really don't see the results. But I think that we have made progress in the time that I have been here. . . .
>
> The changes we are trying to make now are different from what our predecessors [sought.] . . . My main concern now is not that going around campus someone will call me a "spic" or something like that. My concern is getting Latino faculty, Latino courses. So it's kind of a different battle, and it's kind of more long range than short.[187]

Ujamaa-Wesleyan Black Community Student Union

Nadine Finigan, the political chairperson of the 1991-1992 board of Ujamaa—the Wesleyan Black Community Student Union—stated that she had been an active Ujamaa member for about 4 years and a central committee member of Ujamaa for 2 years. In addition, she was a member of the SCC when it was still called the TriMinority Council.

Finigan had been on campus for about a month longer than Wesleyan University president William M. Chace and witnessed how Chace had gone from being a professor to becoming a university president dealing with students, and:

---

[185] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 141-42.

[186] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 142.

[187] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 143 and p. 160.

> It's interesting to note the way that he has actually changed with us, with our class, to a point where he is almost a little bit more accessible to students than he was in the past. That does not mean that all the changes that we want are being made. It's just that he is a bit more accessible.[188]

A May 1994 *New York Times* article reported that Chace was to become president of Emory University, whose campus population has been "about 4 times the size of Wesleyan." The article quoted the Emory University board chairperson as saying that Chace, who earlier taught at Stillman College, the University of California at Berkeley, and Stanford University, "has a deep commitment to the undergraduate experience, and throughout his career he has continued his own dedicated teaching." Chace authored two books on poets and literary criticism and also taught the first black literature course at Stanford.[189]

During the factfinding meeting, Finigan said that in the 4 years that she has been on campus, the institution has been transformed from having "a nondiverse black community to having a very diverse black community." She explained that during her freshman year, most of the students of color, such as the blacks, Latinos, and some of the Asians she knew, were from inner-city urban backgrounds.

> Now, as I've come through, a lot more of the blacks, Latinos, and Asians are from different parts of the United States and not just from the cities. [They are] from different backgrounds. Because of this diversity, our organizations, and even Wesleyan University itself, are having problems in dealing with the diversity within the individual communities.[190]

According to Finigan, Ujamaa has attempted to manage the problem by establishing different focus groups to deal with people from each separate background. A second way has been to introduce the different backgrounds into the regular discussions at Ujamaa. "As a result, we don't represent all of the people all of the time, but we try to represent the needs of all of the students." She explained that Ujamaa members also participated in other groups—the black men's discussion group, the black women's discussion group, the Women of Color Collective, the Wesleyan Student Assembly, and so on. Thus, Ujamaa has become so diverse, that paradoxically it "can try to deal with the wider black community's role. . .

---

[188] Nadine Finigan, political chairperson, Ujamaa-Wesleyan Black Community Student Union, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 143-44 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[189] Associated Press, "Wesleyan President Is Picked to Lead Emory University," *New York Times*, May 13, 1994, p. A-18 (hereafter cited as "Wesleyan President Is Picked . . . .").

[190] Finigan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 144.

We cannot speak for everyone, but can try and speak for the general population.[191]"

Ujamaa has tried to bring issues of importance to the attention of the black community and to the administration. Such details have included the recruitment and retention of faculty of color, the way in which the financial aid program "deals with different types of black students," and whether the Afro-American studies program might be elevated into a department. Regarding the Afro-American studies program, Ujamaa has worked with the two chairpersons of the program "in trying to come up with ways that we, as students, can support the program in its move towards departmentalization."

In addition, Ujamaa has addressed how to affect "the broader perspectives of all Wesleyan University students regarding blacks through lectures, panels, discussions, and speakers." For example, Ujamaa invited the author of *They Came Before Columbus* to help review differing viewpoints on the quincentenary of Columbus' arrival and the former Black Panther, Eldridge Cleaver, to discuss "the rise of conservatism in the American community."[192]

The organization has also held poetry readings and dinners that have focused on the different heritages—Caribbean, southern, and so on—that make up the diverse black community. To combat racism, Ujamaa representatives have participated in race relations workshops to offer their perspectives and have attempted to "help out in other communities when racist events occur within other minority communities on campus."

> [However, such efforts are] kind of like pushing the rock up the hill and watching it fall back down, because you know when you leave in 4 years, there might not be anyone there to keep pushing it for you.[193]

On the other hand, Finigan noted that the weekend following the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting was to be the black and Latino alumni weekend when:

> we get a chance to address our alumni and tell them what we've been doing and how we've been trying to progress in the university and bring the University into an era where all colors, all people, will be able to be comfortable, to be themselves, and to learn about themselves.

Finigan looked forward to hearing from the alumni, eager:

---

[191] Finigan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 144-45.

[192] Finigan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 145-46.

[193] Finigan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 158.

> to hear from them what they did and to look back on the things that we have been taking for granted that they have done—and that they have done for us—and to know that the things that we've been doing and that mean so much to us now will mean something to the students that come after us.[194]

Wesleyan Asian/Asian American Student Union

John Yoo, a member of the Wesleyan Asian/Asian American Student Union (WA/AASU) and its former cultural and social chairperson, explained that WA/AASU contained five committees: political and academic, cultural and social, publicity and outreach, community service, and the committee working with the Student of Color Council (SCC). He suggested that one reason for SCC's name change from the TriMinority Council was that the word "minority" was not used as often at Wesleyan University because "it reeks of 'the other'; it reeks of saying 'Well, we are in the minority, so there has to be a majority out there, and we are in the minority position.'"[195]

At any rate, WA/AASU also had an Asian/Asian American house "which serves as a kind of hub" for all WA/AASU activities. Yoo then theorized that a predicament for "Asians and Asian Americans at Wesleyan University, which is probably indicative of many Asian American students who go to college, is one of lack of identity." Consequently, WA/AASU "tries to build a community so that Asian Americans can learn their identity . . . and see themselves as people of color." This was important since there was no common language or common history among the diverse communities that make up the Asian American community, said Yoo.[196]

In this regard, it may be useful to note a February 10, 1993, *Chronicle of Higher Education* article focusing on "Asian American Groups" and elaborating on the theme.

> Colleges find it difficult to deal with the varying needs of a population that includes refugees, recent immigrants, and native-born Americans and that encompasses more than two dozen ethnic subgroups from places as distinct as China, Japan, Vietnam, and India. . . .

---

[194] Ibid.

[195] John Yoo, member, Wesleyan Asian/Asian American Student Union, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 146 and p. 159 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[196] Yoo Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 147.

> In fact, the vast majority of colleges as well as the [U.S.] Education Department do put all Asian American students together when tracking enrollment and graduation rates. The result: the considerable success of some Asian Americans in gaining access to college and in graduating masks the academic and economic difficulties of others. . . .
>
> Grace Yun, a visiting professor of sociology at Wesleyan University who has taught at several private colleges in Connecticut, says the Asian American students on those campuses are typically very homogeneous. "They're the upper set, middle class or upper class, the model minority types," she says.[197]

At the factfinding meeting, Yoo told the Advisory Committee that Asian American students whose families have been living here for several generations had to face problems of institutionalized racism faced by their ancestors, as in the Chinese Exclusion Act, the taxes imposed on Chinese workers, the Japanese internment camps, and other problems that have become part of Asian American history and culture. Yoo mentioned that, on the other hand, students who were recent immigrants "see themselves as just Asian, but they do not see themselves as Asian like their parents, because [the students] did come over, and they are growing up here and plan on living in America."[198]

Believing that a sense of identity needed to be instilled in academic ways as well as social ways, WA/AASU has also been "struggling with the administration to try to put into academia classes on Asian American identity . . . so that Asian American students can research" their history just as German American students can read about their history. Not only would the inclusion of those classes help Asian American students, but it would also help all students because of the generally increased awareness. WA/AASU's second goal was to combat institutional racism on campus, in the States, and in the world.

Almost a year before the factfinding meeting, the May 7, 1991, issue of *The Wesleyan Argus*, the campus newspaper, reported that Yoo had participated in a rally outside of a class being taught by Wesleyan University President Chace. Yoo presented Chace with a letter from WA/AASU subsequent to allegations made that a group of athletes had uttered racist remarks about Asian wrestlers. The letter emphasized that "This incident cannot be written off, cannot be ignored; it is another in a long line of examples of insensitivity and ignorance."[199]

---

[197] Denise K. Magner, "Colleges Faulted for Not Considering Differences in Asian American Groups," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 10, 1993, p. A-32. See also "On Campus, a Stereotype That Carries a Double Edge . . . .").

[198] Yoo Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 155.

The same article noted that Chace had earlier characterized the alleged incident as "offensive and dismaying and a sad commentary on social life at this campus."[200] Five months later *The Wesleyan Argus* reported that coaches and staff members of the physical education department were to "participate in a racial awareness program before the end of the year in the wake" of the aforementioned incident.[201]

During the factfinding meeting Yoo told the Advisory Committee about a letter on People's Awareness Month that had appeared in an issue of *The Wesleyan Argus*, the date of which Yoo did not identify. The letter to the editor explained that during that month:

> We will . . . not be asking "What country are you from? . . . . Do you know how to use a fork? . . . . When are you going back home to your country? . . . . You speak English so well." . . . People's Awareness Month begins to express the fresh diverse, sophisticated existence to ourselves, and, more importantly, to the other.

Yoo also cited a 1974 letter to the editor that stated that:

> We have studied Anglo-American history since grade school, Anglo-American art, Anglo-American social science, . . . despite the fact that this country was built by black slavery, by immigrant wage slavery, by broken treaties with the American Indians. Very few white Americans at Wes [sic] study our history, our traditions, our cultures.[202]

Yoo observed that "although much has changed [since 1974], much has not changed at all." As evidence, he referred to a third letter, one that had appeared about 3 or 4 weeks prior to the factfinding meeting. The letter commented on an article in *The Wesleyan Argus* that revealed "the lack of credibility or lack of reporting correctly and concisely," according to Yoo.[203] He pointed out that at least five WA/AASU students had given "compelling testimony about the systematic exclusion and sense of alienation they feel in many aspects of campus life." He suggested that, if any had been interviewed, the article might have appeared differently. One student had charged that a professor had made prejudicial comments about her to another teacher and spoke of how this had affected her classroom performance. Another had explained that WA/AASU needed to establish its own library because the resources at Wesleyan University "were so poor." A different student "traced the history of the University's unwillingness to provide adequate institutional support for students and faculty of color."[204]

---

[199] Ben Pappas, "Students at Racism Rally Confront Chace," *The Wesleyan Argus*, May 7, 1991, pp. 1, 9.

[200] Ibid.

[201] Steve Karon, "Racial Awareness Program Instituted for Phys Ed Dept.," *The Wesleyan Argus*, Oct. 18, 1991, p. 1.

[202] Yoo Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 150.

[203] Ibid.

Yoo said that he had not intended "to point the finger at Wesleyan and say, 'You're doing a really bad job,'" even though he believed that there was a lack of support for Asian American studies at Wesleyan University as on most campuses across the country. However, he hoped his remarks indicated that the struggle undertaken by Asian American students, along with other students of color, "puts an undue burden upon them."

Despite problems at Wesleyan University, Yoo acknowledged that "the administration is sympathetic. . . . They might not completely understand where we're coming from, but they do try. And that's one thing that has allowed our students to push forward." He also noted that a report had finally been issued by the Presidential Commission on Race Relations. One of the most important points it seemed to make was that more professors of color need to be hired, and, according to Yoo, that was something Wesleyan University was working on by encouraging students of color to go into academia.

The report also pointed to "the fact that a lot of the executives from the student groups on campus are now in constant communication with the administration." Yoo said that once or twice a month representatives of the student groups have met with the administration and have also invited faculty members to discuss how to resolve problems.[205]

Mendez, of Ajua-Campos, agreed that:

> Asian Americans have a unique position in terms of identity and recognizing themselves as minorities because of the government and because this country really does not recognize them as minorities yet.[206]

At the same time, Mendez believed that:

---

[204] Yoo Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 150-51.

[205] Yoo Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 151-52.

[206] Mendez Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 157.

> African Americans and Hispanics entering college, and especially at Wesleyan University, also do not have that same strong sense of identity, because they do not know their history or culture. . . . [In] terms of curriculum we do not see ourselves reflected in it as much.

Nevertheless, while completing their 4 college years, most Wesleyan University seniors "have a much stronger sense of their identity and their history, and are much prouder about themselves than they were when they came in," according to Mendez.[207]

Wesleyan University Havurah

David Fine, a Wesleyan University Havurah member, remarked that he knew a Jewish man from the Middletown area who had been a student at Wesleyan University some time ago when there was a quota in the number of Jewish students permitted to enroll. He estimated that currently "a third of the student body" were Jewish, and thus, there has been "a lot of change over time."

Although Fine mentioned a seemingly isolated incident involving anti-Semitic grafitti "around the time of the David Duke election," he saw the changing process over his 4 years as generally positive. It included the transfer of leadership from the upper classmen to his class as well as "the growth that takes place within us, in our own Jewishness, and personhood."[208]

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS PANEL

Office of the Dean

Dr. Janina Montero, then dean of the college, had been the first woman and the first Hispanic to serve in that position at Wesleyan University. A native of Argentina who earned three degrees, including her doctorate, at the University of Pennsylvania, Montero has since become dean of student life at Princeton University.[209] In an interview for the

---

[207] Ibid.

[208] David Fine, member, Wesleyan University Havurah, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 153-54.

[209] Rosie Carbo, "Dr. Janina Montero, Princeton University's Dean of Student Life," *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, Jan. 1, 1994, p. 11.

January 1994 issue of *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education,* Montero briefly compared Wesleyan University with Princeton University, observing that "Wesleyan is a very liberal institution, and Princeton prides itself on being very traditional."[210]

During the factfinding meeting, Montero reported that Wesleyan University actively began to recruit students of color in the mid-sixties, and since that time: "it has had its share of campus tensions. Buildings have been taken over, the . . . sit-ins, and even fire bombings in 1990, and [there were incidents] even earlier in the 1960s."[211] The 1990 incidents mentioned by Montero involved at least two separate fire-bombings—including a firebombing incident at the president's office—a gun shooting, and vandalism at the Malcolm X House residence hall.[212]

The May 4, 1990, incident at Malcolm X House was described by the *Hartford Courant* as a "graffiti attack." The graffiti named students as targets, and, according to the *Hartford Courant*, "Some black students said the vandalism was more frightening than the fire-bombings because it was directed at specific students." In response to the incident, the mayor and Wesleyan University President Chace met with students at the dorm, the mayor facilitated more frequent police patrols around campus, and Chace offered a $10,000 reward for information leading to the arrest of the perpetrators.[213]

Though mindful of the severity of such incidents, Montero said she:

> would argue that this history of tensions is also in many ways the history of Wesleyan University's success, since it points to the fact that it has struggled and continues to wrestle seriously with the issue of diversity.[214]

The Nation's ability to meet the challenges of an increasingly pluralistic population was being severely tested in higher education, observed Montero, who then highlighted six "institutional policies and practices that for the last 25 or so years have helped us to foster an educational environment that values access and diversity." The first approach was based on:

---

[210] Ibid.

[211] Janina Montero, Ph.D., dean of the college, Wesleyan University, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 164 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[212] See, for example, Kimberly Shearin, "Scrawled Racial Slurs Rock Wesleyan Campus," *New Haven Register*, May 5, 1990, pp. 1, 12.

[213] Suzanne Sataline, Chris Sheridan, "Graffiti Attack Targets Wesleyan Blacks," *Hartford Courant*, May 5, 1990, pp. 1, 6.

[214] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 164.

> a long-standing institutional commitment to attract critical masses of students of color that are committed to the presence of minority organizations and communities on campus.[215]

The recruitment directive has gone beyond obtaining a number of applicants who identify themselves as members of particular ethnic or racial groups. Both the administration and the admissions office have understood that "the visible presence of active and vital minority communities is one of the most powerful attractions for prospective students of color," said Montero, who reported that for the class of 1995, "28 percent are black, Latino, Asian, or Asian American, and about 23 to 25 percent are Jewish."

Montero also expressed strong support for organizations of students of color, valued their student leadership, adding that such "organizations are not a mark of separatism, but a mark of health." She noted that:

> that is not a necessarily widely shared perspective, but many of us in the institution do take that position. And in some ways, it is also what one would be able to call an administrative position.[216]

She characterized all of the organizations as "extremely well-run. They do an enormous service to themselves and certainly to the institution." She stated that "an absolutely spectacular development" of the last few years involved the organizations that, having "very seriously wrestled with racism within their own communities," banded together to create the Student of Color Council (SCC).

As separate organizations, they each had "established informal links with programs," the Afro-American Studies Center being the administrative base for the Afro-American Studies Program, the Latino student community having informal links with the Latin American Studies Program, the Asian/Asian American organization with the East Asian Studies Program, and Jewish students being "quite close with the Jewish faculty." Montero added that these relationships were "not only political, social, but also academic. Some are stronger than others. I should say that this approach is the right way to go." Meanwhile, the banding together of the organizations to form the SCC was done in such way that they were "showing the majority community how to do it. I'm not sure the majority community is fully paying attention to it, but they certainly are doing it with elan."[217]

---

[215] Ibid.

[216] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 165.

She then explained that Wesleyan University has chosen an institutional approach encouraging students from underrepresented groups to avail themselves of all resources rather than looking for their primary source of support from an individual or "a quote, minority center, unquote." According to Montero:

> No specific administrative office is charged with addressing the needs of minority students. All university resources and agencies are charged with the responsibility of responding to the needs of students of color as they relate to the expertise of that particular resource. . . . All offices have responsibilities for all groups. There is an institutional recognition that special needs may exist for special groups, for certain groups or subgroups, and that every professional in the institution must respond to them.[218]

Montero said that "Many of us strongly support this approach, although we are fully aware of its limitations simply because there is no single-minded dedication or attention to [these] issues."

In addition, Wesleyan University has supported the development of black, Latino, Asian, and Asian American alumni councils. Montero added that:

> these are now strong committed groups of alumni who maintain a special relationship with students of color on campus and provide an additional important source of role models, professional contacts and advice, and also, continued attention and pressure on the university to ensure that the institutional commitment to diversity remains intact.[219]

Montero described the Committee on Human Rights and Relations, a subcommittee of a faculty committee generally charged with "monitoring of the quality of life of students." During the 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1988-89 academic years, it reviewed the status of students of color on campus, and in 1989-90 it conducted a study of Jewish student life. The committee's discussions with academic departments and university agencies and its findings and recommendations "have contributed to establishing an atmosphere of responsiveness. Moreover, there is a structure in place . . . to address the concerns of underrepresented groups as they evolve."

---

[217] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 165-66.

[218] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 167.

[219] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 167-68.

"We must be doing something right," Montero suggested. The class of 1995 had recently been surveyed through the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, and the results indicated that the second most cited reason for having chosen Wesleyan University was the campus' racial/ethnic makeup. That was the reason for 55 percent of Wesleyan University students compared to 20 percent for students at other selective institutions. "Though . . . Wesleyan is doing something right, we are not perfect. . . . We are a positive environment for underrepresented racial ethnic groups."[220]

At the same time, there were four problem areas that Montero thought would either "hit Wesleyan" or "have hit Wesleyan." The first was "that the politically charged nature of the recent discourse on race, ethnicity, and gender seems to have prompted some students and faculty to disengage from the dialogue." Since the beginning of the Reagan administration, there has been a fear of discussing these "difficult or uncomfortable topics," said Montero.

The second problem was that faculty time was being consumed in teaching, research, committee, and professional activities. As a result, faculty members:

> have increasingly less time to enter mentoring relationships with students, not only students of color, but all students. We are missing a faculty interpretation or faculty translation of the standards of the institution, of the complexities of the institutions, for students. It is an important voice that is becoming more and more "hassled" by normal professional pressures.[221]

Thirdly, Montero reported that financial constraints had been taking:

> a severe toll on the resources needed to develop educational programs that address difficult issues. As the demographics change, institutions will need to do much more with much less. Although we fully agree with the students in the sense that they are overburdened with the charge to educate their counterparts and educate the institution, I am skeptical that those burdens will decrease. Chances are they will increase.[222]

The fourth issue was related to the need for higher education to develop mechanisms to evaluate and measure programmatic initiatives. This priority was also being eroded or adversely affected by the financial crisis she had mentioned earlier.

---

[220] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 168-69. See also *The Fiske Guide to Colleges: 1994*, p. 751.

[221] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 169-70.

[222] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 169-71.

Responding to questions about any quandary or dilemma in respecting free speech while at the same time deterring hate speech, Montero alluded to a provision in the general code of the campus:

> specifically prohibiting racial language intended to demean a racial group or person. It has not been tested. I am frankly afraid that when it is tested, the freedom of speech principle will in fact assert itself. . . . I am happy that Wesleyan has that phrase specifically prohibiting [hate speech], but I don't think that we will be able to sustain it, if and when it becomes tested.[223]

Five months after the Advisory Committee's meeting, a *Wall Street Journal* editorial focused on diversity, separatism, and campus free speech. With regard to free speech, the editorial reported that Wesleyan University president Chace had "defended a professor accused of sexism and racism in some books assigned in his course," and that Chace had "noted the existence of a 'sad honor roll' of institutions that have allowed and encouraged students to declare certain books and ideas illegitimate—and to consider as appropriate only that which reinforces or exalts a group.'" The editorial pointed out that Chace was among specific campus administrators who "refused to be bulldozed by threats of unrest or by fear of being smeared as one of those who stands in the way of progress."[224]

Reflecting Montero's doubt expressed about the constitutionality of prohibitions against racial language and Chace's reported position on controversial books and ideas, a May 1990 *New York Times* article focused on incidents at Wesleyan University and elsewhere in Connecticut. The article observed that most campuses across the Nation have responded cautiously because of concerns that "plans [to combat racism] might infringe on constitutional guarantees of due process and freedom of speech." The article stated that, for example, in the fall of 1989 UCONN officials "removed a portion of the student code prohibiting certain offensive materials, speech or gestures, after a Federal judge warned that the code appeared to violate first amendment rights of free speech."[225]

By February 1994, a *Hartford Courant* editorial noted that UCONN and other schools had abandoned hate-speech bans, and the same editorial specifically encouraged Wesleyan University to "follow the recommendation of a student-faculty committee and drop [its] campus hate-speech ban."[226] More recently, an April 1994 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported that college officials became "increasingly anxious" about first amendment rights versus the possible ramification of proposed guidelines describing how the U.S. Department of Education would investigate racial or religious harassment complaints filed on their campuses. For example, at least two college presidents reacted with concern to guidelines warning that:

---

[223] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 181.

[224] "They Call It 'Diversity,'" *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 29, 1992, p. A-16.

[225] The Associated Press, "Higher Education Board Focuses on Campus Bias," *New York Times*, May 20, 1990, n.p.

> a college can be held responsible for racial harassment committed by a variety of people over whom the institution may have no control, such as guest speakers. . . . [T]he department could investigate whether a university's response [to controversial comments by a guest speaker] is sufficient to insure that the campus environment does not become hostile for minority students.[227]

On another issue related to the proposed guidelines, a May 1994 *Washington Post* article reported that college officials around the U.S. as well as the American Council on Education (ACE) have voiced doubt about the efficacy or legitimacy of campus codes aimed at restraining racial harassment in verbal, graphic, or written communication. Commenting on the draft Federal guidelines, the ACE general counsel suggested that colleges might be caused to violate the first amendment; as some officials argued, the proposed guidelines "fail to distinguish between incidents and expressions of racial harassment." The article further noted that several State courts have already struck down "school 'speech codes' seeking to regulate offending and hateful campus speech."[228]

Office of the President

Dr. William Adams, the executive assistant to President Chace, noted that the code aimed at hate speech was a clause inserted into Wesleyan University's already existing Code of Non-Academic Conduct. That clause:

> makes clear that the prohibition of harassment includes [a prohibition against] racial harassment. . . . We, of course, went through all the debates that universities have gone through on this matter. . . . There is still concern about it. . . . There are people who wish we did not have such a policy. But

---

[226] "Free Speech on Campus," *Hartford Courant*, Feb. 14, 1994, p. B-8.

[227] Scott Jaschik, "First Amendment Implications of Harassment Rules to Be Studied," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Apr. 27, 1994, p. A-24.

[228] Mary Jordan, "Harassment Guidelines Questioned," *Washington Post*, May 1, 1994, p. A-19.

> the administration was very clear in recommending that policy to the faculty, which did adopt it, in fact, in a vote.[229]

Speaking more generally, Adams observed that many institutions of higher education, Wesleyan University among them, were distinguished by certain special commitments, including a complete and abiding commitment to freedom of expression and to genuine understanding. Special obligations flowed from these commitments such as "the promotion of a genuine and deep understanding of ethnic and racial differences as we find them in American life and beyond American life."[230]

At Wesleyan University, the fulfillment of those obligations has been sought through the achievement of diversity, the genuine understanding of that diversity within the institution among students and faculty, and "understanding the meaning of that diversity for the educational mission of the institution and for its curriculum in particular," said Adams. For background, he mentioned four initiatives undertaken by Wesleyan University. In 1989-90, President Chace:

> after having had not quite 2 full years on campus, by presidential initiative, developed a special policy to reinforce the recruitment and retention of minority faculty. That initiative was prompted by concerns created by minority faculty members leaving Wesleyan University for other institutions and secondly, by a growing national understanding that the competition for minority faculty would increase over time.[231]

In May 1990 a *New Haven Register* news article covering a rally of "more than 500 Wesleyan University students" reported that:

> A chief complaint among black students is that Wesleyan has failed to adequately attract and retain black faculty and administrators. . . . "People who are important to black students have left," said Bobby Clark, spokesman for Wesleyan. Four black faculty have left within the last 12 to 18 months, he said. . . .[232]

---

[229] William Adams, Ph.D., executive assistant to the president, Wesleyan University, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 182-83 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[230] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 171-72.

[231] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 172-73.

[232] Kimberly Shearin, Jonathan Brinckman, "Racist Act Sparks Rally at Wesleyan," *New Haven Register*, May 6, 1990, p. A-1.

Just 3 days later, a *New York Times* article focusing mainly on a student-organized "Unity Day" also reported that the Afro-American studies program chairperson described the departure of 6 of 11 black faculty as "a dramatic exodus," and that the chairperson and 8 other black faculty signed an open letter in the campus newspaper, stating that Wesleyan University should have done more. "If the administration had a coherent policy to retain minority faculty, they might have remained," speculated the 9 cosigners.[233]

However, the next day, the editorial of the *Middletown Press* cited at the opening of this report also focused on "the difficulty of hiring minority faculty." It pointed out, for example, that "one black Ph.D. in mathematics [was] the output of the Nation in 1988, and other disciplines with no doctorates awarded to blacks, and very few to Hispanics." The editorial even recognized that "when Wesleyan, as a nationally esteemed institution, is successful [in hiring minority faculty role models] other colleges try to raid its professoriate."[234] In May 1994 the *New York Times* reported that the board chairperson of Emory University which had recently named Wesleyan University President Chace to assume the presidency at Emory University stated that Chace "had shown leadership in appointing women and minority members to faculty and staff positions."[235]

During the Advisory Committee's meeting, Adams said that the elements of Wesleyan University's policy included a more careful monitoring of faculty searches by the administration, the creation of a faculty committee on minority recruitment and retention, a commitment to find support for more endowed positions for minority faculty, and measures to improve faculty retention despite "dramatically increased competition for those members across the country." In this regard, the aforementioned *Middletown Press* editorial stated that President Chace "has already intervened in faculty hiring processes to ensure that black applicants get a total hearing, even if not the number one choice, but there are limits to this process as well. . . ."[236]

The activities of the faculty committee on minority recruitment and retention were to have been addressed by one of its members, Alex Dupuy, who had agreed to appear before the Advisory Committee but was unable to attend because of a personal emergency, explained Adams. At any rate, the results of Wesleyan University's efforts to boost minority faculty employment have been good, Adams reported, though there remained "a long way to go." For the 1991-92 academic year "of the six approved authorized tenure track searches at Wesleyan in 1991-92, four have produced hirings of minority faculty members, with one search still in the offing, which looks very promising."[237]

---

[233] Kirk Johnson, "At Wesleyan, a Day to Reflect on Racial Tension," *New York Times*, May 9, 1990, p. 10.

[234] "The Ironic Tumult on the Hill."

[235] "Wesleyan President Is Picked . . . ."

[236] "The Ironic Tumult on the Hill."

With regard to the retention of minority faculty, after President Chace's issuance of the policy on affirmative action, a recommendation was made that the administration revise the way in which it kept track of retention statistics. The administration was nearing closure on its discussions with the faculty committee on minority recruitment and retention on this matter. Summarizing the available data, Adams said that:

> the current figure is 6.6 percent of all tenure track positions are held by faculty of color. The figure in 1987-88 was 5.4 percent. If you add into that adjunct faculty and visiting faculty, the figures are respectively in 1987-88, 8.2 percent, and in 1991-92, 13.2 percent.[238]

Adams explained that the institution relied upon visiting and adjunct faculty for "a number of programs, particularly in music." He said that there were "considerable numbers of people involved in those programs," and this helped to explain the difference between the percentage of tenure track and visiting and adjunct faculty.

A second "fundamental initiative" was the President's Commission on Racial Relations and its August 1991 report that Adams then left to a faculty panelist to detail. The third initiative dealt with the better understanding of multiculturalism. Adams said that the question was "how do we express within the center of the academic mission of the institution and in the curriculum the meaning of the increasingly multicultural reality, both in the institution and in the United States as a whole?" To aid in the quest for an answer, a Ford Foundation grant funded the development and teaching of new multicultural courses and a faculty seminar on multiculturalism, Adams reported.[239]

Mention might be made here of a June 1990 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article that surveyed campus tensions around the Nation, noting what former U.S. Department of Education Secretary Ernest L. Boyer called a "breakdown of civility." The article also highlighted problems at both Trinity College in Connecticut and Wesleyan University and the rally and hunger strike organized to protest then-recent incidents at the latter campus.[240] In addition, the article observed that "colleges are serving as a primer for improving race relations in society at large," and quoted then Wesleyan University dean of the college Edgar F. Beckham who pointed out that:

---

[237] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 173-74.

[238] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 184.

[239] See also the description of the funded activities as discussed by Professor Robert S. Steele, chairperson of the Wesleyan University department of psychology, on pp. 94-96.

> One source of this turmoil is the sustained efforts of institutions of higher education to develop their diversity. They're at the frontier, and life at the frontier is often unpleasant.[241]

Just a few weeks earlier, *The Wesleyan Argus* interviewed President Chace about campus protests and reported that:

> Chace discussed the difficulties of making racism impossible on a campus given the fact that individuals are free to "behave as they deem appropriate." "Racism is the poison of this century, and it permeates everything we do," Chace said. "I would love to have it removed, expunged from this campus permanently, but I don't see any prospect of that fully succeeding here or in any part of the United States, and that is a regrettable thing, but I think it is a realistic thing."[242]

During the factfinding meeting, Adams said that another initiative would be underway to "map the curriculum and its multicultural components . . . [and] describe both to ourselves and to students what those offerings are and how they are related to one another." Adams left that initiative to be described by a faculty panelist. The final intiative encompassed the efforts to attract minority students "to the idea of joining the professoriate, to go to graduate school and to become members of institutions like Wesleyan University." With support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts, Wesleyan University was developing programs with that goal. He added that there was hope that the Federal Government would provide a grant to support the programs in 1993.

Adams believed that the problem of recruiting minority faculty was the most important problem on college campuses. None of the problems:

> will be solved in the long run unless, we, as a society and a country, can make progress on drawing members of minorities into those professions. Until that point, we will be robbing Peter to pay Paul in all cases. And that

---

[240] Denise K. Magner, "Racial Tensions Continue to Erupt on Campuses Despite Efforts to Promote Cultural Diversity," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 6, 1990, pp. A-1, A-29.

[241] Ibid.

[242] Ben Pappas, "Students at Racism Rally Confront Chace," *The Wesleyan Argus*, May 7, 1991, p. 1.

> is not a happy prospect.[243]

He concluded by encouraging the Advisory Committee "to stress as strongly as you possibly can the need for the Federal Government and State governments . . . to support those programs and to make progress on that absolutely fundamental issue."

Office of the Associate Dean

Rick McLellan, associate dean, noted that Assistant Dean Harold Horton and Harry Kinney, the director of public safety, had accompanied the panel of administrators, but McLellan would introduce some of the activities or institutional programs to which they had contributed. He then explained that upon arrival new students were oriented through a program:

> designed among other things to sensitize them to, and heighten their awareness of, prejudice. A "differences panel" presents them with perspectives from students representing a variety of differences including race and religion.[244]

The resident adviser staff also conducted "role plays that address differences in a series of skits depicting common situations on campus." The skits suggested "appropriate ways of responding. "Within the framework of new student orientation, but not in a matter that conflicts, students of color have organized minority freshmen orientation to expose new students of color more individually to campus personnel and resources," said McLellan. These new students have been "encouraged to make use of, for example, the writing workshop, the career planning center, the dean's office, faculty and other staff, as well as the various student organizations."[245]

Because much of a student's campus experience "takes place within the residence units, a number of efforts are made to create a positive, supportive environment for all students." Residence staff, for example, have undergone extensive training, including a "cotraining program focusing on multicultural sensitivity" for residence advisers and peer counselors, and a separate full day on multicultural sensitivity for the residence staff.

---

[243] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 176.

[244] Rick McLellan, associate dean, Wesleyan University, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 177 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

[245] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 177-78.

McLellan noted that a subcommittee of resident assistants was devising ways of "making the residence units sensitive to multicultural issues," and former resident assistants have constituted an advisory body to help the resident staff deal with racial concerns. The year prior to the factfinding meeting, some former resident assistants of color voiced concerns that led to many of the changes McLellan described. He also mentioned that in the 1993-94 academic year a new residential unit, Intercultural House, was to open to bring diverse students together in a supportive atmosphere in which the programs and activities of the house were expected to benefit the campus community.[246]

Though the administration's goal has been to make all of the university "responsive to the special needs of students of color, the attendant lack of centralization makes it difficult to know what is happening along these lines," McLellan continued, "nor do these efforts seem coordinated and cohesive as an institutional effort." Examples of such efforts included those in the science and economics departments aimed at enhancing the performance of minority students and encouraging them to pursue graduate study in those areas.

Also, in collaboration with the Black Alumni Council, the Hispanic Alumni Council, and the Asian Alumni Council, various staff have been developing a mentor program to link students with alumni. The Career Planning Center has organized outreach efforts through its peer counseling staff and two annual workshops for seniors and underclassmen. The writing workshop has employed minority students as teaching assistants for outreach and aid to other minority students. A member of the dean's staff participated in a "'road show' sponsored by the Consortium on Financing Higher Education . . . promoting graduate studies and academic careers."[247]

McLellan said that in addition to the Mellon Foundation and Pew Charitable Trust grants mentioned by Montero, a Pew grant has helped to:

> provide staffing to complement the academic experience of students of color by focusing on their extracurricular efforts. A Hughes grant has enabled [the university] to organize programs which promote and enhance interest and performance in the sciences—for area high school as well as for current Wesleyan University students.[248]

A Rockefeller Brothers Foundation grant was to support two students of color "preparing for careers in public school teaching as well as their faculty mentors." An application also was to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for a McNair grant to help promote graduate study among first generation, underrepresented, low income students.[249]

---

[246] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 178-79.

[247] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 178-80.

[248] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 180.

In recent years, staff members of Students Services, the Office of Public Safety, the Career Planning Center, and several academic departments have undergone sensitivity training organized by professional staff and by student groups. A group of students has also been meeting regularly with Montero, Adams, McLellan, and Assistant Provost William Weitzer to discuss recruitment and retention of faculty of color, premajor advising, and identifying and increasing courses containing a multicultural focus.

Having at the outset pointed to "the difficulties associated with the lack of centralization" in the institution, McLellan said that he was heartened to hear that although the same kind of problem—fragmentation—was affecting the students, they, too, were addressing it. At the same time he emphasized that:

> we are feeling very torn about it—on the one hand, wanting to recognize the need for individual students to feel comfortable in an environment; on the other hand, recognizing the divisive nature that that kind of fragmentation can have. So we are beginning to look at it and thinking about ways to respond to that.[250]

Adams, Montero, McLellan on Accountability

Advisory Committee member Sanabria, who was moderating the factfinding meeting, asked on behalf of other Committee members whether there was a formal process of evaluating accountability at the faculty and the staff levels in trying to achieve the various objectives that the three administrators had identified. "Were the individual administrators and associates evaluated for their contributions to the efforts made to advance cultural diversity and pluralism?" inquired Sanabria.

Adams replied that one of the purposes of the faculty committee on minority recruitment and retention was to provide a point of accountability in the sense that a faculty group would be closely observing "the regular and visiting appointments." But as to whether individuals were evaluated specifically in terms of Sanabria's question, Adams responded,

---

[249] Ibid. In May 1993 McLellan reported that the grant was awarded in the spring of 1992. Attachment to letter from Rick McLellan, Wesleyan University, to Tino Calabia, May 21, 1993.

[250] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 180-82.

"No, not in a formal sense."[251]

Montero said:

> That is the case in Student Affairs. However, because it affects such a large number of students, obviously, and it is so crucial to the quality of life—both for students of color and majority students—it is important from our point of view that issues of affirmative action and program evaulation fall within our evaluation procedures.[252]

McLellan added that he had been a member of the committee on human rights and relations and that in the past year the committee had begun following up on its last review of racial matters, which had taken place in 1985. The committee surveyed various offices in terms of what had been accomplished since the recommendations had been made. "We found there was certainly progress," said McLellan. "The different offices were responsive and had begun to do more outreach and to organize annual activities of the kind that I talked about earlier."[253]

As for the students' assessment of these matters, Adams remarked that "The students are never shy about letting us know how we are pursuing these objectives." He stressed that "we are in this for the long run, . . . though things do not move as fast as they should in the world or at Wesleyan University."

Sanabria then referred back to the policy that De Rocco had mentioned requiring each college or university in Connecticut to submit to the State Department of Higher Education its plan on promoting pluralism and eliminating bias. Sanabria asked whether the plan or policies of Wesleyan University coincided with those acceptable to the State board.

Adams explained that Wesleyan University:

> is not required to comply with those regulations flowing from [the department of higher education] or from the board of governors. . . . We are not compelled to comply, but . . . we have developed policies that we think are institutionally appropriate to cover those same concerns. But we did not model them on the State's regulations.[254]

---

[251] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 185-86.

[252] Montero Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 186.

[253] McLellan Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 186-87.

[254] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 187-88.

When Sanabria inquired if Wesleyan University was required to follow the State's process for accreditation, Adams replied that Connecticut College, Trinity College, Wesleyan University, and Yale University have charters from the State of Connecticut that exempt them "from the regulations of the State Statute 10A-34." In turn, Sanabria asked if Wesleyan University's "only mandates on these, then, are the requirements of the Federal processes?" Adams answered that the mandates were from the Federal Government "or our own internal mandates."[255] In June 1994, when the department of higher education issued its second annual report on campus incidents, the *Manchester Journal Inquirer* stated that Wesleyan University, Trinity College, and Yale University, "whose leaders argue they are exempt from some higher education policies," had not filed incident reports.[256]

Sanabria followed up by asking the Wesleyan University panelists for data comparing the composition of the Wesleyan University faculty with the faculties of comparable institutions. Adams replied that the data on his campus had not always been "compiled in a way that would be totally comparable." But there was interest in the data Sanabria sought because the Wesleyan University Presidential Commission on Racial Relations had recommended such comparisons, according to Adams, and the administration would be looking at it "now that we have our own methodological house in order, so to speak."[257]

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY FACULTY PANEL

Biology Department

J. James Donady, the chairperson of the biology department and former cochairperson of the Presidential Commission on Racial Relations, noted that he had not been chosen to appear by the Wesleyan University administration. He had been invited by the Advisory Committee to make a presentation, although he hoped that the administration would have selected him had the opportunity been theirs. Professor Donady surmised that the Advisory Committee had invited him because he helped to chair the racial relations commission, whose work had actually sprung from what had some time ago been called the TriMinority Council. In 1989 that council asked the president to create the commission, and in February 1990 the president appointed a nine-member body composed of three faculty, three administrators, and three students, plus staff.

---

[255] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 188-89.

[256] Associated Press, "Board Questions Uptick in College Bias Reports," *Manchester Journal Inquirer*, June 16, 1994, p. 8.

[257] Adams Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 189.

Donady explained that:

> Several very difficult racially oriented incidents took place on campus that spring. In fact [the incidents] did not precipitate the commission's being formed, but they did affect the work of the commission. We found ourselves spending a good deal of time trying to make sense out of how the community felt about the insults that were being heaped upon it by these incidents.[258]

Nonetheless, in June 1990 the commission issued an interim report, one that had no binding power and did not reflect policy. "The really singular point we made in that report was that Wesleyan University suffered from a communications problem," which had been alluded to by several previous panelists, said Donady, who observed that similar remarks had earlier been made by UCONN panelists, too.

> [M]any of the programs that you just heard about, that have been in existence for some time, in fact, were not known by the constituencies for whom they were established. The interactions that take place between articulate, bright, aggressive students and administrators—ones as you've seen today—there frequently is not communication from those students back to their constituency that these dialogues are taking place.
>
> Furthermore, Wesleyan University, though I think much better now, but at that point, could clearly be criticized, both at the faculty level and at the administrative level, for not wanting or needing to listen to students until a problem arose. And how big a problem it had to be for some dictated how fast they were willing to listen. I think we have made a great deal of progress in reference to communication.[259]

In September 1990 a *Hartford Courant* news article reported that the presidential commission had concluded in June 1990 that "Part of [Wesleyan] University's problem has been its failure to let people know what has been done."[260] At that time Donady told the *Hartford Courant* that "In many cases what we found was that Wesleyan was already well started. . . . Part of our suggestion was to greatly improve the communication." The article went on to report that "Chace and other administrators and faculty say they hope to meet that goal . . . . [and that] Chace said defining 'multiculturalism' will be a task for the decade."[261]

---

[258] J. James Donady, former cochairperson, Presidential Commission on Racial Relations, and chairperson, biology department, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, pp. 190-91 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript). See also Montero discussion and description of the spring 1990 incidents, p. 74.

[259] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 191.

[260] Chris Sheridan, "Colleges Statewide Working to Improve Racial Sensitivity," *Hartford Courant*, Sept. 2, 1990, pp. B-1, B-6.

During the factfinding meeting, Donady recalled that in September 1990, midway through the presidential commission's activities, "the newest affirmative action plan was put forth by the new president. And we spent a fair amount of time dealing with specific points in that affirmative action plan as concerns that we had and recommendations that we made in the final report. . . ." In August 1991 the commission produced its final report.[262] Donady summarized its basic lesson as indicating that Wesleyan University "has institutional, structural problems as they relate to dealing with racial issues." He said that "many of the structural issues are virtues in some aspects, but in reference to solidifying the campus in reference to communication [and] accountability, they in fact may be drawbacks for issues such as racial relations."

Consequently, for 2 years, some faculty, students, and administrators expended "a great deal of effort," and received "excellent support—moral and financial—from the president to bring in outside specialists and representatives from other campuses," continued Donady. He noted that the commission produced 50 specific recommendations addressing 21 concerns.

> We have since then had a campus review of that final report over the past year, and we are about to receive the president's response to that report. . . . I've seen a draft document, which I'm quite pleased with. It was not an instant response, because, if you have noticed, many of the recommendations that we've made involved other activities on campus, other groups on campus, faculty groups, for instance. And so the president has not responded until hearing from those faculty groups, at least given ample time to hear from them. . . .[263]

He did not expect all the recommendations to be approved and pointed out that, "if the educational policy committee [of the faculty] does not deem a matter worthy of legislation, it does not bring it before the faculty for a vote." At any rate, he summarized a sampling of recommendations "to highlight what has been done and what hasn't been done, and how problems have been corrected or attempted to be corrected, in some cases have not been." The commission's first recommendation involved requesting a comparison between Wesleyan University and similar institutions as well as target goals and a reasonable timeframe for reaching those goals. Donady acknowledged that:

---

[261] Ibid.

[262] The nine-page document, *The Quality of Life of Persons of Color at Wesleyan: Recommendations for Its Enhancement; the Final Report of the Presidential Commission on Racial Relations*, Aug. 1, 1991, is available in the Eastern Regional Office of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (Hereafter it is cited as *The Quality of Life of Persons of Color at Wesleyan*.)

[263] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 192-93.

> we are going to have failures in meeting such goals, but the commission felt those failures, as long as they were not headhunting failures, would in fact be stimuli, and would force the institution to realize, "Well, we thought we had a reasonable time to accomplish this, but we didn't. We need to do better."[264]

The commission also requested the establishment of a faculty committee on recruitment and retention, so that the faculty could become involved in those processes. That committee was established and had been working all year, and Donady noted that Professor Alex Dupuy of the committee was to have described its work during the factfinding meeting, but was unexpectedly unable to appear. "Funds have been sought for recommendation 6.1, and a proposal for a McNair program is the latest grant-funding attempt that is being waged."

As a member of the biology department, Donady pointed out that:

> In the sciences we have the least number of faculty of color of any of the divisions. Often that is zero. That certainly needs to be corrected. But in the interim, what we are trying to do is to bring role models onto campus and to supplement the obvious lack of such role models in the active tenure track faculty.
>
> The Hughes Program in Life Sciences has developed a Minorities in Science Seminar Program and has brought more than a dozen outside speakers who give seminars for the regular faculty frequently, but more importantly, meet with minority students and explain to them the difficulties they had in working their way up through the academic white male ladder. And it has been a wonderful experience for faculty like myself as well as the students.[265]

The commission also asked for the creation of a permanent subcommittee of the faculty's educational policy committee (EPC) to deal with ethnic diversity in the curriculum, said Donady. He explained that that committee had a duly elected membership and in accordance with its bylaws dealt with curricular issues. However, Donady found it unfortunate that the EPC considered the presidential commission's recommendation but decided against establishing the requested subcommittee.

---

[264] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 193.

[265] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, p. 194.

> I have not read their report, so I am not sure of all their reasons. But, in fact, when something does not happen, it is not always the administration that is making that decision. In this case, clearly a group of faculty members don't think that's a good idea. . . . Recommendation 9.1 . . . asked that courses that address historical experiences of minorities be included in the general education expectations of all students. They, too, decided that they would not further recommend that.[266]

Donady applauded recommendation 11.1 asking for multicultural course listings, which his fellow panelist was to describe. Recommendation 15.1 requested that the faculty student affairs committee create a subcommittee on issues of race, diversity, and ethnicity. Because that elected faculty committee had not yet completed its deliberations, Donady was unable to report on its decision. Recommendation 20.2 asked that the statistics on admissions be made "much more available"; he noted that the class of 1995 is 28 percent minority, which he believed was the highest percentage ever.

In addition to the refusal of faculty committees to adopt some of the aforementioned recommendations, Donady pointed to other problems. As a student panelist suggested earlier, the institution is "horizontal,"[267] said Donady, who added that:

> the faculty are quite independent, and the major political units on campus are departments. It is those kinds of organizations and structures that must be either broken down or infiltrated with ideas and activities to, in fact, be taking place in reference to recruitment and retention.[268]

He believed that improvements in recruitment and retention had occurred and he hoped that the 1991-92 academic year's success in filling four out of six tenure track faculty positions with minorities indicated that "the administrative handling of those positions has influenced departmental decisions." Though he could not recall any recommendations addressed to the board of trustees, he thought that the three new faculty positions would draw the attention of the trustees who would be concerned about the required funding.

In closing Donady quoted the report which stated that:

---

[266] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 194-95.

[267] See discussion by Mendez, p. 65.

[268] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 195-96. See also discussion by Mendez, p. 65.

> "What we need is a positive climate of expectation that can only be affected by a strong and persistent administration working together with a committed faculty in coordinated effort, to recognize, understand and communicate with all groups related to the concerns of people of color." I see Wesleyan University's success and its future and its problems and how to deal with them lying much more with the faculty and how it responds to both students and administration.[269]

Although the report is too long to append, its preface warrants noting here:

> there appears to be a more sluggish ability of our community to cope with the increasing problems because of the fragmentation and miscommunication apparently built into the university structure. The sporadic attempts to understand and eliminate problems of race relations have been hindered by the Byzantine channels of communication, the inchoate nature of the faculty, and the weakness of central authority. . . .
>
> To the extent that . . . the faculty and administration form the core of the university, this core has little credibility among students of color. . . . The presidency is seen as a largely reactive office with a limited means of enforcing its policies. At the same time the faculty appears uncommitted to change. . . .
>
> . . . [T]he structure must involve a clearer line of communication and command between the president and the individual faculty member. And it is here, at the level of the individual faculty member, that students of color and the entire community would be positively affected.[270]

Department of Psychology

Robert S. Steele, the chairperson of the department of psychology, reported that when the multicultural grant from the Ford Foundation materialized, there initially was a series of faculty seminars that helped faculty members to "find what we were doing in terms of multiculturalism and what we are not" and to attempt "to really coordinate faculty endeavors in multiculturalism, to inventory what Wesleyan University has achieved over the last 25 years."[271]

---

[269] Donady Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 196-197.

[270] *The Quality of Life of Persons of Color at Wesleyan*, pp. 3-4.

[271] Robert S. Steele, chairperson, psychology department, testimony before the Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, hearing, Farmington, Apr. 27, 1992, transcript, p. 197 (hereafter cited as Hearing Transcript).

Professor Steele said that Wesleyan University's:

> engagement with multiculturalism has a long history . . . [of] . . . the kind of yearly effort that never makes the headlines but makes for real institutional change over time. In the last 25 years [Wesleyan University] has built up a substantial inventory of classes which deal with roughly multicultural themes.
>
> This inventory is so broad that multiculturalism can, at Wesleyan University, be studied, really, within the context of something that we are tentatively calling World Studies. That is, instead of multiculturalism being the context for other studies, we think that at Wesleyan University multiculturalism can be worked into a notion of broader understanding of the variety of cultures, both in the United States and in the world at large. World Studies at Wesleyan University is taking shape in the mapping of crosscultural, international, and multicultural courses.
>
> This articulation of Wesleyan University's many offerings in these areas will aid students, faculty, and administration in planning, coordinating, inventorying, and publicizing the vast array of classes taught at Wesleyan University which have as a theme the study of the varieties of the human experience within American society and around the world. If, as President Chace has said, our aim is to cultivate and nourish in our students the knowledge, the intellectual skills, and the habits of mind they must have in order to succeed as active, self-conscious, and critical members of the complex world they are now inheriting, . . . we, as educators, must prepare them to navigate in that world.[272]

Steele characterized curriculum development on college campuses in the last decades as yielding "curricular sprawl," and said that it has become necessary to take inventory in order to "provide students and faculty with coherent curricular planning for the next decade." With funding from the Ford Foundation, Wesleyan University has undertaken the intiative around multiculturalism, and:

> The rich resources in courses and faculty Wesleyan University has amassed over the last 20 years are being brought together in revitalizing ways to produce a curriculum which is not only multicultural in the narrow sense of representing scholarship on race, ethnicity, class, and gender in America, but which also broadens the scope of multiculturalism itself.[273]

He stated that the aim was to achieve pluralistic multiculturalism or world studies

---

[272] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 197-98.

[273] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 198-99.

"composed of classes dealing in cross-cultural issues, international issues, multicultural issues, and issues of identity." Over 300 courses in cultural, multicultural, and cross-cultural topics were offered by a full-time faculty of about 280 to an undergraduate student body of about 2,600. The curriculum was spread over 26 departments and programs and "linked formally by cross-listings and informally by faculty affinities and student initiative."

The challenge for Wesleyan University was coordination, said Steele, describing the institution as "tremendously rich" but one that has needed to devise a way "to take that richness and marshall it towards some definite goals. And I think that multicultural education is one of those goals that the administration, students, and faculty have all decided to focus resources towards." At the same time, Steele argued that the challenge for Wesleyan University:

> and other institutions with diverse and rich curricula is not to build a new curriculum which attempts to represent, however tentatively, the vast variety of cultures and ethnicities within the United States, and, even more ambitiously, the world. The challenge is for Wesleyan University to organize its vast array of courses into a coherent curriculum which will encourage faculty collaboration and enhance undergraduate education in intercultural, international, multicultural, and cross-cultural studies.[274]

He said that the complexity of offerings already in the school catalogue provided the essential resources for building a multicultural curriculum. "However, this curriculum exists in inchoate form. Organizing this often near-chaos is made difficult by structural and economic features." Wesleyan University has been structured by divisions, departments, and programs, but that structure has tended "to increase fragmentation across the curriculum." Any proposal building on existing courses within the traditional structure and making no demands on faculty time or university funds could lead to a better orchestration of the school's assets by grouping them into multicultural clusters.

Steele explained that a cluster was a grouping of courses around a theme, topic, or pedagogical focus, even though those courses were in different departments, divisions, and programs. They varied in size, embracing from as few as 7 classes to over 60 classes. Clustering helped to bring faculty together and to provide students with maps of different parts of the curriculum, giving them guides to how classes—often from diverse departments and programs—can be fitted together to provide integrated courses. Clustering also afforded faculty an opportunity to integrate their existing courses into an intercultural and international framework; because the faculty "will initiate the linking of courses to a cluster, it is they who will generate the actual working definitions of multiculturalism at Wesleyan

---

[274] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 199-200.

University."[275]

In this way, a truly pluralistic multicultural curriculum representing many diverse perspectives might materialize, said Steele. Moreover, the connections set up between courses may lead faculty to two new forms of cooperation and intellectual sharing. But above all, the multicultural clusters would give students a new vision of the curriculum, "one in which they can see how courses span departments and programs to link up in challenging new intellectual formations."

At the time of the factfinding meeting, 12 such clusters had already been identified, said Steele. They included the United States, the Caribbean, and Africa. One cluster wove together over 24 courses under the theme of the African, African American, and Caribbean experiences and identity. Another connected Asian and Southeast Asian studies, and there were cross-cultural studies in religion and society.

Steele expressed enthusiasm for a first-year cluster called Welcome to World Studies, "a set of almost 50 courses, all with some sort of cross-cultural, or multicultural theme that will introduce students to the very rich catalogue of classes that Wesleyan has dealing with race and ethnicity and class and gender." The largest multicultural cluster contained about 60 courses drawn from Afro-American studies, American studies, economics and women's studies, and was entitled Ethnicity, Class, and Gender in America.[276]

Other clusters included International Studies, Languages and Programs Abroad, Latin American Studies, Science in Society, the Culture Cluster covering various theories of culture, and a cluster in world music, spanning the music of cultures from around the world and from within the United States. According to Steele, giving them a coherent form has been "truly a challenge . . . and in fact, we are using computer simulations of the curriculum to try to figure out some kind of coherent way through this very richness."

At the same time, with the wealth of different classes diffused throughout Wesleyan University's curriculum, it became possible to avoid the "pitfalls associated with tokenism and the ghettoization of diversity," said Steele. He foresaw that over the next few years Wesleyan University could both preserve and pool together its resources and enhance its richly diverse course offerings.

Without additional faculty or financial resources, such diversity can be trans-

---

[275] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 200-01.

[276] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 201-03.

> formed from the disorder of the present into interlinked clusters which will provide an intellectually integrated curriculum for the next decade. And I think multiculturalism will—if my travels around the country and my work at Wesleyan University proves the case—be really a center for bringing diverse curricula together in a new, at least a subset of university study.[277]

Just 2 days after the Advisory Committee's factfinding meeting, a lengthy article appeared in the April 29, 1992, *Chronicle of Education*. Entitled "Rethinking the Culture of Disciplines," it touched upon the kind of issues discussed by Steele and suggested that:

> Too often, academics cannot see the profound intellectual or "cultural" values inherent in their particular disciplines. We rarely recognize that "multicultural" tensions can be found not only in matters of ethnicity and race, but also between and among our disciplines. If we could recognize how culture-bound our disciplines have made us, and if we could appreciate the enhanced perspectives that interdisciplinary connections allow, perhaps integrating multicultural content into our curricula might make more sense to us.

After further elaboration, the author of the article ends by explaining that:

> I am not so naive as to suggest that it is easy to leap from understanding our discipline-based cultures to accepting ethnic and racial diversity in the content of our courses. But if we are ever to succeed in the latter goal, we gradually must lead our colleagues from their own culture-bound disciplines into other intellectual frameworks and, eventually, beyond those to the cultures of other ethnic and racial groups. Diversity is more than just a game of numbers or political expediency. In a world as diverse as ours, we need the intellectual breadth and depth throughout the university that other cultures can provide.[278]

---

[277] Steele Testimony, Hearing Transcript, pp. 203-04.

[278] Raymond J. Rodrigues, associate academic vice president, Colorado State University, "Rethinking the Cultures of Disciplines," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Apr. 29, 1992, pp. B-1, B-2.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPEAKERS

Expanded and updated through the citation of various documents—some widely available or accessible to the general reader for further reference—this report benefits primarily from presentations made by 30 speakers who participated in an informal fact-finding meeting convened on April 27, 1992, in Farmington, Connecticut.

The opening presenters included the commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Higher Education, the Region I Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education, the director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in Connecticut, and the Hillel Foundation director based at UCONN/Storrs. (The head of the Connecticut Association of Latin Americans in Higher Education subsequently submitted a statement that has been condensed for this report.) The remaining 26 participants served on panels representing either students, administrators, faculty, or staff from UCONN/Storrs or Wesleyan University.

The student panelists included the head of UCONN's student government and officers or members of racial or ethnic minority organizations from both institutions. A visiting foreign student also represented his UCONN organization. Among the administrators from UCONN were the president, a vice president, a dean, an associate dean, the director of an ethnic cultural center, and the directors of affirmative action on two UCONN campuses. Several UCONN professors also spoke. From Wesleyan University came the dean of the college, the executive assistant to the president, and an associate dean as well as two professors, one of whom had chaired Wesleyan University's Presidential Commission on Racial Relations.

Despite the wide diversity of perspectives, there was unanimous agreement that forms of bias-related problems and tensions adversely affected each of the two institutions and also that campuses needed to accommodate the increasingly multicultural elements of American society. The State's commissioner for higher education, noted that his board had "given priority to encouraging diversity on campus," and, like several panelists from the two campuses, he also attributed the prejudice or racism at the heart of the problem to prejudice and racism prevalent in society at large.

The UCONN president enumerated many intiatives that had been taken to stem incidents, but pointedly added that "I, as president, am not satisfied that enough has been done." Though also not entirely satisfied, some students perceived that a degree of progress had been achieved over the course of their few years at their schools, and administrators and a few faculty identified steps that their institutions had taken over many years to reduce or eliminate problems. Faculty members generally agreed that positive changes have occurred over the long term, but a few voiced feelings of deja vu regarding some of the problems mentioned.

At the same time, many panelists—students, administrators, and faculty—touched upon a variety of incidents or alleged incidents ranging from naive but offensive remarks or questions to grafitti attacks, provocative speeches, and verbal and physical assault. The visiting foreign student outlined problems involving housing, admissions, and ethnic and racial disputes and expressed disappointment in how some cases were handled at UCONN. As for related issues, students, administrators, and faculty lamented the low ratio of minority students and teachers and the continuing need for diversifying the curricula.

Hispanic students, administrators, and faculty at UCONN also bemoaned the dearth of Latino teachers and the fact that requests for an institute on Puerto Rican and Latino studies had gone unheeded for over two decades. Asian American students, administrators, and faculty at UCONN noted that Asian American students constituted the largest minority group on campus, and yet the administrators and faculty charged that special minority advancement programs were not available to Asian American students, and that faculty were confronted by a glass ceiling barrier. A black UCONN student noted that minority students who attended a 6-week summer program were required to take a course on racism and how to combat it, but the course was not offered in the regular schoolyear and not required of nonminority students.

Wesleyan University was said to have attained one of the highest proportions of minority students on any American campus. Yet some minority students and faculty at Wesleyan University noted a kind of structural problem impeding progress. A cochairperson of the Presidential Commission on Racial Relations said specifically that his university has "institutional, structural problems as they relate to dealing with racial issues," but he also stressed a communications problem. On the one hand, he and others noted that administrators and faculty sometimes failed to listen to students until an incident occurred or a press conference was called. On the other hand, according to the same cochairperson, problem-solving programs existed, but were unknown to many of those for whom the programs were intended. One administrator rated the recruitment of minority faculty as the biggest problem, reporting that in today's competitive market, minority faculty successfully recruited by one school were often lured away by another.

A black student observed that during her 4 years at Wesleyan University the black student community had become more diverse within itself, a welcome phenomenon but one that also yielded difficulties for both the school and even the black student community. A Latina student complained that the school has been reactive, responding more after incidents, and that some faculty may have been resistant to curriculum reform. An Asian American student referred to old and recent letters appearing in the campus newspaper on problems related to diversity, and argued that "although much has changed [since 1974], much has not changed at all." The same Asian American student acknowledged that the administration was sympathetic and was attempting to increase the pool of minority faculty.

Various speakers alluded to pockets of somewhat self-segregated students, perhaps divided by their separate organizations. However, if this contributed to campus tensions and if minority students had organized to combat such problems, their response was viewed by at least one Wesleyan University administrator as a possible sign of health. Speaking more generally, the State higher education commissioner observed that systems on campuses have emerged "within which there is now the potential for dealing functionally and importantly with the deeper causes that separate people. . . ."

Among the ideas or recommendations that found support among the panelists were some dealing with courses aimed at helping students, especially new students, to appreciate and respect cultural differences. Three panelists called for such a course to be taken by all students as a requirement, with a UCONN professor explaining how well the required course in the school of social work was ultimately received despite the initial hostility shown by some students. Other panelists urged that the basic curriculum also become further diversified, and one panelist suggested that diversity should go beyond the academic disciplines and student organizations into all other phases of university life as well.

Structural problems were felt to exist in one form or another on both campuses. Panelists from each campus recommended that restructuring or conscious efforts at coordinated program development be undertaken. For example, a UCONN student reported that the various cultural institutes believed that appointing "some kind of multicultural affairs provost" would be helpful. A UCONN professor speculated that, if programs or attempts at solving problems continued to be designed separately by staff, faculty, and students, "10 years from now we'll be sitting right here talking about the same thing." At Wesleyan University, the presidential commission proposed—though unsuccessfully—the establishment of a permanent subcommittee within the faculty's educational policy committee that would deal with ethnic diversity in the curriculum.

Some students, administrators, and faculty voiced the need for boosting the representation of various minority groups both in the student body and among the faculty. The UCONN student government head reported that his organization had supported lobbying efforts in Washington aimed at gaining increased scholarship help for underrepresented students. A UCONN administrator urged more outreach for candidates in minority communities.

At the same time, since the recruitment of minority faculty seemed to be a significant problem on college campuses, a Wesleyan University administrator called upon the Advisory Committee to encourage the Federal and State governments to support programs that would tackle the issue. In this regard, the presidential commission at Wesleyan University proposed another structural recommendation, and this time the presidential commission succeeded in gaining the establishment of a faculty committee on recruitment and retention.

As for tensions provoked by speakers espousing messages known to antagonize racial or religious minority students, the State ADL director cautioned against taking steps leading to censorship; instead, he recommended that campus officials adopt a policy of not expending student activities funds on such speakers. "One does not have to roll out a red carpet. . . . Saying we are not welcoming someone is different from saying we are going to prevent them from speaking."

Lastly, a statement submitted for the record by the CALAHE president, outlined three recommendations that emerged during CALAHE's April 1993 annual conference. They included diversifying a college's curriculum "to validate and make visible the contributions of Hispanics," educating non-Hispanic faculty and staff regarding multicultural issues, and applying consistency in all systems of reward and in taking disciplinary actions.

VI. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing, the Connecticut Advisory Committee offers the following findings and recommendations:

1. **Finding:**

By all accounts, bias-related incidents have occurred at UCONN, a large State-supported institution, and Wesleyan University, a small selective private institution. Top administrators, some faculty, and concerned students of racial and religious minority backgrounds have taken measures to combat problems. However, many measures already adopted may not be widely known on campus; problems continue, and administrators and others believe more must be done.

Recommendation:

Though some incidents on each campus have often received considerable attention and been widely reported, the problem-solving programs that have been initiated and other related efforts aimed at combating bigotry need to be equally well-publicized by university administrators, campus media, and other news outlets. Activities organized by students should also gain increased coverage and support, perhaps through assistance to the students from the university leadership among administrators and faculty.

2. **Finding:**

Structural needs of varying degrees were mentioned as affecting both campuses. Though fewer concerns were voiced about UCONN, a student panelist pointed to the various cultural centers and student organizations at UCONN, but added that there was no point of coordination. Another student acknowledged that talk continued about recruiting a multicultural affairs head, but warned that such a head without a structure would not yield the desired results. At Wesleyan University one panelist noted her frustration at working "in a structure that's more horizontal than vertical," and a key faculty panelist described the school as having "institutional, structural problems as they relate to dealing with racial issues . . . [and] in reference to communication [and] accountability. . . ."

Recommendation:

UCONN should appoint an officer close to the provost level to concentrate on multicultural and diversity issues and give appropriate weight to their consideration. Wesleyan University should implement the *Final Report of the Presidential Commission on Racial Relations* and its recommendations, especially where it determined that the university's "structure must involve a clearer line of communication and command between the president and the individual faculty member. And it is here, at the level of the individual faculty member, that students of color and the entire community would be positively affected. . . ."

3. **Finding:**

At the student level, minorities of color have banded together in support of new courses, programs, and institutes aimed at studying their different cultures and chronicling their contributions. Some religious minorities—such as Jews who have also been historically the victims of intolerance—do not easily fall under the rubric of "students of color" and may tend to be omitted from multicultural activities and concerns. On occasion, the appeals of Jewish students made to minorities of color during times of perceived tension have not been heeded.

Recommendation:

Administrators, faculty, and concerned students should help other students to become more mindful of the status and needs of all students from racial and religious minority backgrounds. Distinctions are often self-evident between students of color and other students. But the former should guard against allowing what unites them—being students of color—render them forgetful of those discriminated against on the basis of religion and not necessarily on the basis of skin color.

4. **Finding:**

Asian American students make up the largest or one of the largest minority groups on some New England campuses. However, the "model minority" stereotype of the Asian American student may prevail in New England and at UCONN and Wesleyan

University in particular. Asian American students are perceived by some students and faculty on campus as not being among the protected classes of minority groups.

Recommendation:

Irrespective of their academic standing, Asian American students should be accorded the same treatment as other protected classes in terms of programs meant to benefit racial and religious minority groups, and not only when those programs are federally subsidized. Campus-based administrators such as affirmative action officers may need to ensure that new administrative staff and faculty as well as each new cycle of students are informed of the composition of the protected classes.

5. **Finding:**

Panelists from among the students, faculty, and administrators at UCONN and Wesleyan University have indicated that some faculty appear resistant to efforts to diversify curricula and otherwise adapt to the changing composition of the student body and to the new demographics of the Nation. For example, a Wesleyan University student mentioned the traditionalists among the tenured faculty, and the cochairperson of Wesleyan University's Presidential Commission on Racial Relations said that recommendations by his commission were dismissed by a faculty policy committee. Moreover, without singling out the faculty or any other sector of campus, the UCONN president himself stated that "there are those on our campuses who do not believe that the kinds of issues dealt with by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights are of importance to them."

Recommendation:

Continued efforts at communications and interaction with faculty members and others who object to multicultural programs or ignore minority pleas must be sustained. The official policies of UCONN and Wesleyan University as well as the Connecticut Department of Higher Education include a recognition of the need for positive change in the diversifying world on campus and beyond. To meet the goals of these policies, performance evaluations of faculty should include elements related to the ability to accommodate change.

6. **Finding:**

Extensive media coverage and other reports have documented to what degree overt bias-related acts of harrassment at UCONN and Wesleyan University have disturbed campus officials and frightened some students. Overt attacks aimed at minorities in the form of graffiti, physical assaults, and other forms of harassment have involved student or other youthful perpetrators.

Recommendation:

Where the severity of bias-related incidents warrants it, significant cash rewards for information about perpetrators—such as has been offered on at least one occasion at Wesleyan University—should be offered on both campuses.

7. **Finding:**

Many high school graduates leave virtually segregated neighborhoods and arrive on college campuses without having much experience relating closely or positively to students of races or religions different from their own.

Recommendation:

A course on racial and religious bias, its causes and effects, and how to reduce it—often a requirement for minority students—should become a required course for all new students. An elementary overview of America's changing demographics might prove useful in introducing such a course. Interested students, more senior in college grade or age, should be considered for involvement in the design and implementation of the course.

8. **Finding:**

Problems continue to arise over how to cope with controversies stemming from appearances by speakers whose messages have been previously known to cause tensions between or among groups of students of various racial or religious backgrounds. Bans against hate speech which have been considered by both UCONN and Wesleyan University have been recognized as potentially harmful to first amendment rights on those campuses and elsewhere.

Recommendation:

Campus authorities should consider ways of demonstrating that speakers bearing messages widely known to intimidate students of other races or religions may be allowed their first amendment rights to appear but are not welcome. Policies governing the expenditure of student activities fees, the use of campus facilities, and the deployment of campus security should be reviewed. Once specific policies on how to allow or accommodate appearances are formulated, they should be published and circulated among the campus community. The university's leadership within the administration and faculty should speak out on the issues raised.

Appendix A

1992 College Enrollment by Race

Total	Native American	Asian American	Black	Hispanic	White
United States					
12.54 million	110,000 0.88%*	613,000 4.89%	1,281,000 10.22%	887,000 7.07%	9,381,000 74.8%
UCONN/Storrs					
24,131	0.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.0%	85.6%
Wesleyan University					
3,332	0.1%	8.2%	7.7%	5.2%	75.2%
UMASS/Amherst					
24,185	0.3%	3.9%	3.1%	3.1%	82.6%
Smith College					
2,901	0.3%	11.0%	3.9%	5.0%	73.9%
UVM/Burlington					
10,885	0.2%	2.3%	0.8%	1.2%	93.5%
Middlebury College					
2,112	0.1%	3.4%	2.8%	3.0%	85.8%

Source: "College Enrollment by Racial and Ethnic Group," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 23, 1994, pp. A-35–A-40.
* Percentages will not total 100 percent because foreign students of all races are omitted.

APPENDIX B

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Department of Higher Education

Board of Governors for Higher Education

Policy Regarding Racism and Acts of Intolerance in Connecticut Colleges and Universities
(Adopted July 18, 1989)

Background and Rationale

Colleges and universities throughout the country and in Connecticut recently have experienced a disturbing rise in student-to-student violence, often race-related. This new wave of racism is especially dangerous since it enlarges the evils of discrimination to include harassment, physical violence, and abuse. In settings where racial minorities are subject to attack, no group that is different from the majority is safe.

Acts of intolerance not only are morally reprehensible but also are contrary to the promotion of pluralism. Pluralism is of particular importance in higher education, since it is an essential requirement for the free and open pursuit of knowledge and understanding. Students, faculty, and staff create a marketplace of ideas on college campuses by bringing multiple perspectives to a single enterprise. Colleges and universities must reflect the racial, religious, and ethnic diversity of society in order to prepare students to live productively in that society. Similarly, all persons, regardless of any condition of their being, must be able to pursue higher learning in an environment free from acts of hatred and the threat of violence.

It is not enough, therefore, to open the doors of the campus. All who enter must encounter a climate of acceptance, one characterized by justice and fairness.

This policy addresses racism and other acts of bigotry by calling for a reaffirmation of Connecticut higher education's commitment to: (1) acknowledging the worth of all persons within the higher education community; (2) promoting pluralism; and (3) seeking an end to acts of intolerance.

Principles

The Board of Governors for Higher Education, in adopting this policy, sets forth the following principles:

1. Colleges and universities have a duty to foster tolerance.
2. The promotion of racial, religious and ethnic pluralism within higher education is a responsibility of both individuals and the higher education community.
3. Every person in the higher education community should be treated with dignity and assured security and equality.
4. Individuals may not exercise personal freedoms in ways that invade or violate the rights of others.
5. Acts of violence and harassment reflecting bias or intolerance of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and ethnic or cultural origins are unacceptable. Since these acts are inconsistent with the teachings and values of higher education, individuals who engage in such behaviors have no place on college campuses.

Institutional Responsibilities

Each Connecticut college and university shall develop the following plans and procedures and submit them to the Board for its review by ~~December 1, 1989~~ March 1, 1990:

1. A plan to promote pluralism, which includes the identification and elimination of practices counter to pluralism.
2. A statement condemning racism, intolerance, and other acts of hatred or violence based on differentness.
3. A plan to inform the campus community, including students, faculty, and staff, about the statement.
4. A plan to educate the campus community about appropriate and inappropriate behaviors, which includes activities intended to increase sensitivity and encourage acceptance of others.
5. A process to hear and resolve grievances relating to this policy in a timely fashion, which identifies remedies and imposes penalties, up to and including suspension and expulsion.

Implementation of this policy will be reviewed as provided for in Section 10a-34-11 (g) of the Regulations for Licensure and Accreditation of Institutions and Programs of Higher Learning. Part of the institutional accreditation process will consist of review of reports submitted annually by each college and university to the Board of Governors, beginning in January 1991. These reports shall include the number, type, and disposition of incidents that occurred during the previous calendar year involving acts of violence and harassment reflecting bias or intolerance of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and ethnic or cultural origins. The reports also shall describe activities undertaken to promote pluralism and to educate the campus community about appropriate and inappropriate behaviors.

07-19-89

61 Woodland Street • Hartford, CT 06105
An Equal Opportunity Employer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

THE WRONG WAY TO REDUCE CAMPUS TENSIONS

A STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

The academic community is alarmed by reports of intergroup tension at many colleges, including those long committed to equal opportunity. Unfortunately, educators have failed to reassess some recent policies and practices that, far from promoting tolerance and fairness, are undermining them. Worse yet, many have seized upon incidents of conflict to call for the extension of these policies and practices. They include:

- a willingness to admit students widely disparate in their level of preparation in order to make the campus demographically representative
- preferential hiring for faculty and staff positions determined by race, ethnicity, and gender
- racially or ethnically exclusive financial aid and academic counseling programs, as well as special administrators, ombudsmen, and resource centers assigned to serve as the putative representatives of selected student groups
- punitive codes restricting "insensitive" speech
- mandatory "sensitivity training" for incoming freshmen and sometimes for all students, faculty, and staff
- requirements that students take tendentious courses dealing with groups regarded as victimized
- a failure to enforce campus rules when violated by those promoting these policies or other "politically correct" causes

The National Association of Scholars believes that these policies and practices involve either the application of a double standard or the repudiation of appropriate intellectual criteria. Consequently, they undercut the academy's special sense of common purpose and prompt divisive calculations of group interest. Specifically, we believe that:

The admission of seriously underprepared students creates unrealistic expectations and frequently leads to frustration and resentment. Moreover, policies that target specific minority groups unfairly stigmatize all students in such groups, reinforcing negative stereotypes.

Two-track hiring threatens to produce a two-tiered faculty instead of a genuinely integrated one. While such hiring may well create "role models," they will be the wrong kind, encouraging the belief that it is the assertion of group power instead of the pursuit of individual achievement that reaps the most abundant rewards.

Disadvantaged students deserve ample assistance, yet disadvantage need not coincide with race or ethnicity. Those excluded are often frustrated by seeing individuals who may be no worse off than themselves receiving special treatment solely because of ancestry. Furthermore, bureaucracies created to serve or champion particular groups tend to have vested interests in emphasizing differences, fostering complaints, and maintaining the separation of those groups.

Safeguarding intellectual freedom is of critical importance to the academy. Thus, it is deeply disturbing to see the concept of "discriminatory harassment" stretched to cover the expression of unapproved thoughts about selected groups or criticism of policies assumed to benefit them. Higher education should prepare students to grapple with contrary or unpleasant ideas, not shield them from their content. What is more, if a highly permissive attitude toward the excoriation of the "privileged" accompanies the censorship of critical views about other groups, a backlash is predictable.

Tolerance is a core value of academic life, as is civility. College authorities should ensure that these values prevail. But tolerance involves a willingness, not to suppress, but to allow divergent opinions. Thus, "sensitivity training" programs designed to cultivate "correct thought" about complicated normative, social, and political issues do not teach tolerance but impose orthodoxy. And when these programs favor manipulative psychological techniques over honest discussion, they also undermine the intellectual purposes of higher education and anger those subjected to them.

If entire programs of study or required courses relentlessly pursue issues of "race, gender, and class" in preference to all other approaches to assessing the human condition, one can expect the increasing division of the campus along similar lines.

The discriminatory enforcement of campus regulations can only sap the legitimacy of academic authority and create a pervasive sense of mistrust. Indeed, should students feel that repeated violations not only go unpunished, but are actually appeased, the reckless may be tempted to take matters into their own hands. The final stage of discredit will be reached when students and faculty see in such appeasement attempts by administrators to justify their own programs of campus "reform."

The policies just described are generally well-intentioned. Nonetheless, if the goal were deliberately to aggravate campus tensions, the same policies might well be adopted. On the premise that the fair treatment of individuals can do as much to correct the current situation as the doctrine of collective guilt has done to create it, the National Association of Scholars urges the following:

- admitting inadequately prepared students only when realistic provision can be made for remediation
- maintaining nondiscriminatory hiring policies
- eliminating all forms of institutional segregation and preferential treatment determined by race and ethnicity, together with administrative positions that foster ethnic dimension
- protecting the expression of diverse opinion
- avoiding programs that attempt to impose "politically correct" thinking
- adding or retaining ethnic or gender studies courses only when they have genuine scholarly content and are not vehicles for political harangue or recruitment
- enforcing campus rules, even with respect to those who feel they are violating them in a good cause

The National Association of Scholars believes that the surest way to achieve educational opportunity for all and maintain a genuine sense of academic community is to evaluate each individual on the basis of personal achievement and promise. It is only as individuals united in the pursuit of knowledge that we can realize the ideal of a common intellectual life.

For copies of this or other NAS statements, or for additional information about the National Association of Scholars and its activities, including its fellows program, research center, speakers bureau, search service, newsletter, state and regional affiliates, conferences, local events, and the quarterly *Academic Questions*, write to the National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, or call 609-683-7878

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE ASIAN FACULTY & STAFF ASSOCIATION

APPENDIX D

University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269

President:
Peter Luh U-157
(203) 486-4821
Home (203) 429-0456
Vice Presidents:
Roger Buckley U-103
(203) 486-3560
Farah Ibrahim-Schroeder
(203) 486-0199
Secretary:
Angela Nichols U-206
(203) 486-1188
Treasurer:
Ana Irwin U-206
(203) 486-1189
Executive Committee:
Irene Conlon U-175
(203) 486-2943
Norman Garrick U-37
(203) 486-2990
Devendra Kalonia U-92
(203) 486-3655
Ramesh Malla U-37
(203) 486-3683
Suresh Nair U-41IM
(203) 486-3641
Narasimhan Srinivasan
U-41M, (203) 486-2563
L.S. Thakur U-41IM
(203) 486-2581
T.C. Ting U-237
(203) 486-5462
Kuang-Wei Wen U-41IM
(203) 486-5140
Hong Xiao
(203) 486-6307

Advisory Board

Robert Bard, Prof.
UConn Law School
Paul Bock, Pres.
Asian-American
Council of CT
Elizabeth Mejia
Associate Director
Women's Center, Storrs
Isnoel Rios, Director
Puerto Rican/Latin Amer
Cultural Center
Peter Kiang, Prof.
Sociology Dept.
UMass - Boston
Ronald Takaki, Prof.
Univ. of California
Berkeley
Richard Vengroff, Dean
Int'l Affairs, Storrs
Grace Yun, Prof.

Past President (1989-90)
Paul Bock, Prof. Emeritus
Home (203) 236-4090

April 29, 1992

Mr. Tino Calabia
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Eastern Regional Division
1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Room 710
Washington, D.C. 20425

Dear Mr. Calabia:

It was very nice meeting you last Monday during the Forum on Campus Tensions. I appreciated your effort in organizing it, and the opportunity for me to present issues faced by Asian Americans. Attached please find a revised statement of my presentation. If I can be of further help, please contact me at (203) 486-4821 or fax (203) 486-3789.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

Peter B. Luh
Professor and President
Asian Faculty & Staff Associ.

FORUM ON CAMPUS TENSIONS, APRIL 27, 1992

STATEMENT BY PETER B. LUH, REVISED APRIL 29, 1992

Professor of Electrical and Systems Engineering, University of Connecticut
President of UConn Asian Faculty and Staff Association

OPENING

- Asian American issues wakened by the Dec. 3, 1987 incident and led by Professor Paul Bock.
- Asian American is the largest minority group at UConn. Statistics based on *1990/91 Fact Book* and *1992 Affirmative Action Plan*::

	Undergraduate*	Graduate	Total
Asian	**623**	**169**	**792**
Black	583	125	708
Hispanic	483	154	637
Native American	41	10	51

	Cat. 1**	Cat. 2	Cat. 3	Cat. 4	Total
Asian	**1**	**62**	**46**	**6**	**115**
Black	11	27	68	15	126
Hispanic	0	24	20	22	66

* All campuses.
** All campuses, full time. Cat. 1: executive/administrative/managerial; 2: faculty; 3: non-teaching professional; 4: secretarial/ clerical.

- The **fastest growing** minority within the State and also nationwide.
- 66% of **international students** are from South and East Asia (696 out of 1047).
- With **little** cultural, social, psychological and academic **recognition or support. No** Asian American Studies Program, **no** Asian American Cultural Center, **not** part of the Minority Advancement Program, Glass Ceiling, etc.
- **No need for support?** The myth of **Model Minority?**
- A lot of difficulties faced by Asian Americans. Many incidents happened since December 3, 1987.
- Faculty, staff and students have been **mobilized** - Asian Faculty and Staff Association, Asian American Student Association, United Asian Student Council, ALANA, etc. The administration has also been supportive.

INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION

- Asian Americans are not part of Minority Advancement Program nor Engineering Minority Program. Is this a modified version of "**Chinese Exclusion Act**" continuing?
- Asian applicants might have been **discriminated against job opportunities** if one examines the number of applicants, number of interviews, and number of hires (for the period from 8/1/90 to 7/31/91, 1992 Affirmative Action Plan):

Category 1

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Appl.	11	24	15	494	544
Inter.	1 (9.1%)	3 (12.5%)	3 (20%)	31 (6.3%)	38 (7.0%)
Hires	**0 (0%)**	**1 (4.2%)**	**0 (0%)**	**6 (1.21%)**	**7 (1.3%)**

Category 2

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Appl.	651	88	103	3781	4623
Inter.	24 (3.7%)	8 (9.1%)	12 (11.7%)	321 (8.5%)	365 (7.9%)
Hires	**9 (1.4%)**	**0 (0%)**	**5 (4.9%)**	**78 (2.1%)**	**92 (2.0%)**

Category 3

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Appl.	150	192	121	4498	4961
Inter.	32 (21.3%)	45 (23.4%)	16 (13.2%)	523 (11.6%)	616 (12.4%)
Hires	11 (7.3%)	6 (3.1%)	1 (0.8%)	109 (2.4%)	127 (2.6%)

A FEW EXAMPLES

- Civil Engineering Department: Preference will be given to U.S. citizens and permanent residents who received **all three degrees** in the United States. Why need to have all three degrees in the U.S.?
- President of Graduate Student Senate: The laying off of the International Student Advisor would affect Asian American students' visa processing.
- First Asian/Asian American History Month at UConn, April 1992: $400 from Student Union Board of Government for Asian Cultural Festival; $500 from the President's Office; **no fund** to rent the film "Who Killed Vincent Chin" at the cost of **$125 - iniquity** as compared to other minority groups with funded programs.
- Professor Acie Murry's racial incident - a piece of rope knotted around some black material hanging from the knob of his office door. The climate for minority is **deteriorating.**
- The UConn Library refused to have Asian language collections until recently.
- **Asian language programs** are **orphans** as compared to other language programs in terms of program status, courses offered, faculty, resources, etc. Modern and Classical Languages: Classics (6 courses listed on the *General Catalog*), Classics - Greek (11), Classics - Latin (17), French (33), German (51), Hebrew (11), Hebrew Civilization (10), Italian (23), Italian Studies (5), Portuguese (19), Russian (27), Spanish (39), **Critical** Languages Program (7, including Chinese, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, Gaelic, Hungarian, Japanese, Lithuanian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Yiddish, etc.).
- A few other cases are currently under investigation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- University curriculum and programs need to reflect, respond to, and support the diversity in American population to achieve a truly multi-cultural environment - **Asian American Studies Program, Asian American Cultural Center, Asian language collections in the library, Asian languages program.**
- Institutional discrimination must be abolished.
- All faculty, staff and students have to be sensitized on multicultural issues.
- The administration has been supportive so far. **More effort and commitment, however, are urgently needed.**
- Time for action is now - a matter of priority. The severity of the current financial crisis is clear to all of us. This crisis, however, may never end. What we are asking for during this very difficult time is an **incremental, planned, and committed** building up of the Program.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1994 - 161-699 QL 3